DUE DATE

Late Fine Ordinary books 25 p. per day, Text Book Re. 1/- per day, Over night book Re. 1/- per day.

STUDIES
IN
INDO-MUSLIM HISTORY

Supplement = Volume II

STUDIES

IN

INDO-MUSLIM HISTORY

Supplement = Volume II

A Critical Commentary on

ELLIOT AND DOWSON'S

HISTORY OF INDIA

as told by

its own historians

BY

the late

SHAHPŪRSHĀH HORMASJĪ HOḌĪVĀLĀ

incipal and Professor of History (Retd.), Bahāuddīn College, Junāgaḍh

Author of "Studies in Parsi History"

"Historical Studies in Mughal Numismatics"

"Studies in Indo-Muslim History, Vol. I"

DISTRIBUTORS

THE POPULAR BOOK DEPOT

LAMINGTON ROAD, BOMBAY 7

1957

PRINTED BY—S. R. Sardesai, B.A., LL.B., at the Navin Samarth Vidyalaya's Samarth Bharat Press, 41 Budhwar Peth, Poona 2.
PUBLISHED BY—R. S. Hodivālā, B.A., 8 Manockji Mehta Road, Poona 1.

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

A typescript of this work named by the author himself as *supplement* to his very widely received and appreciated work *Studies in Indo-Muslim History* was left by my late father unprinted and unpublished as he could not fulfil his heart's desire during his life-time, the work having been completed shortly before his demise in 1944. My late father had informed me before his death that the typescript was almost a press copy of the work and had instructed me to get it printed and published if he could not do so and I cannot but express my sincere regret for having not been able to publish it earlier due to my transfers and very heavy and responsible office duties which also involved continuous touring. When, however, I was posted at Poona I fortunately came in contact with late Dr. Irach J. S. Taraporewalla who assured me that his book, *The Divine Songs of Zarathushtra* which is certainly an abnormally technical work was printed to his entire satisfaction by the Samartha Bharat Press in Poona and I therefore entrusted the printing of my late father's work to this Press. Dr. Taraporewalla who had great admiration for my late father's scholarship agreed to read the proofs, but after some time unfortunately on account of his health he could not do so and I then entrusted the work of proof reading to Mr. G. H. Khare, the Curator of the Bharata Itihasa Samshodhaka Mandala, Poona, who assures me that he has done his duty as best as he could. Mr. Khare, when he saw the typescript, found it to be complete having an index as well kept ready by the author and he informs me that while reading the proofs he has compared almost all the Persian extracts with the original texts and filled in the lacunæ where the same were detected. It will be observed that the author has adopted the old mode of transliteration which stresses on pronunciation. Mr. Khare, being a great admirer of the author's erudition, acumen, patience, hard work, and zeal for accuracy, as he has often expressed to me, has, I believe, tried his best to do as much justice as he could for this posthumous publication but the readers are the best judges.

The original work (or the first volume) of which this book forms a supplement only has been already introduced to the scholarly world

by the Foreword of a scholar of the eminence of Sir Richard Burn who has in his separate review described it as a truly magnificent work which generations of students will bless and I have been advised to reproduce the foreword in the second volume. I have also got reprinted the author's preface to the 1st volume for the reader's convenience.

I feel great satisfaction in seeing the wish of my beloved father fulfilled by the publication of his posthumous work and I hope it will be received by the scholarly world with equal warmth as the former.

Last but not the least, I take it to be my duty to express my regret once more for the late publication of this book and crave indulgence from its readers for mistakes, typographical or otherwise, that may have crept in, in this posthumous publication.

1st August 1957
8, Maneckji Mehta Road,
Poona 1.

RUTTONSHA SHAPURSHA HODIVALA.

FOREWORD TO VOLUME I

Professor Hodivala won the gratitude of all students of Indian numismatics by his constructive 'Studies in Moghul Numismatics' based on wide reading and collation of original sources and careful reasoning from the facts. Those Memoirs have also helped historians to verify, correct or supplement the statements of the Persian writers of Indian History.

He has now undertaken the more onerous task of annotating Sir Henry Elliot's "History of India as told by its own Historians," and he brings to this the ripest fruits of life-long scholarly studies. In the sixty odd years which have elapsed since the last volume appeared, new texts or better manuscripts have been discovered and Indian, European and American writers have produced many important works. Professor Hodivala has worked through all the new material, selecting or criticising and adding his own suggestions where previous comments do not exist or appear unsuitable. Though all these may not prove acceptable, as the author himself would be the first to admit, the book is one which every student of Elliot should be glad to refer to, and its intelligent use will prevent the repetition of early errors which are still being copied in modern books and articles.

R. BURN.

Oxford,
6th June 1939.

PREFACE TO VOLUME I

Elliot and Dowson's work was published about sixty years ago and its value has only grown with the lapse of time. It is still indispensable to every serious student of the Muḥammadan period of Indian History. It is universally quoted, and deservedly too, as an authority of the first class and even regarded by many readers as the very last word on the subject. It is true that several scholars have casually drawn attention to its errors and shortcomings, but these scattered criticisms and casual animadversions have had little or no influence on the general opinion in favour of its infallibility. It has continued to be followed in spite of them and it cannot be denied that this universal vogue and reputation has been responsible for misleading many modern authors, the dissemination of not a few inexactitudes and the circulation of some false and distorted history. It seemed, therefore, necessary in the interests of sound scholarship, to undertake a systematic and exhaustive review of its contents and rectify its errors of interpretation, as well as transliteration. The writer has ventured to undertake this laborious and difficult task and has, at the same time, availed himself of the opportunity to discuss and elucidate questions which were ambiguous or controversial. He has also devoted considerable attention to the restoration of the names of persons and the identification of toponyms which had been left in obscurity. An attempt has been also made to determine the chronology in disputed cases by the application of the week-day test, where it was available. He ventures to think that no one who glances through these pages will declare that such a critical and explanatory commentary was uncalled for and he trusts that his labours will make it possible for students to make a more intelligent and more profitable use of the original work. He lays no claim to be an historian. His object has been merely to investigate, ascertain and verify facts, to reject statements which were inaccurate or without adequate proof and to place the subject on a sounder critical footing.

It is seventy years since Blochmann remarked that our knowledge of the Muḥammadan period of the history of this country was very limited and inaccurate in regard to details. It is true that much useful work has been done since he wrote, that many original sources have

been more or less carefully edited and correctly translated, but these pages should convince any one that there is still considerable room for intensive critical labour and research in this field.

Many points are still so obscure and incomprehensible that there is no prospect of arriving at an opinion in regard to them. They have had to be passed over in silence, as it was not possible to say anything useful about them.

But there are other problems which are not so hopelessly intractable and the reader will come across in this volume, several attempts to find new answers to questions which have exercised the ingenuity of previous inquirers or have been left untouched by them. Some of these suggestions and identifications are admittedly hypothetical or tentative and the writer begs that they may not be taken for more than they are worth and that they will not be supposed to have anything definitive about them. They have been put forward only for provoking discussion or stimulating research and eliciting more satisfactory solutions. It will be seen that a few have been already modified in the Corrections, and no one will be more ready to accept more convincing explanations.

Lastly, the writer would like to say that no one could entertain greater or more sincere admiration for the stupendous labours, either of Sir Henry Elliot, who collected, with astonishing ardour and perseverance for forty years, a prodigious quantity of manuscript material, or of Professor Dowson, who worked hard for more than twenty, in arranging, sifting and translating it. Nothing could be further from his thoughts or more remote from his wishes than the intention to say anything to disparage or detract from the merit of their monumental performance. His only object has been to enhance the usefulness and value of their work and to bring it up to the standard of modern knowledge. He will think himself amply rewarded, if he is thought to have cleared some of the ground and facilitated, even in a small measure, the compilation of a more accurate and scientific history of the Muḥammadan Period than any which we possess at present.

The indulgence of the reader is craved for the long list of Errata and typographical imperfections.

S. H. HODIVÂLÂ.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

While referring to these abbreviations, those that are given in Volume I should also be consulted in case of necessity.

A.A.R.	Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthān; J. Tod; ed. W. Crooke.
A.G.I.	Ancient Geography of India.
Āīn.	Āīn-i-Akbarī; B. I. Text.
A.N.	Akbar-Nāma; B. I. Text.
A.Ṣ.	'Amal-i-Ṣāliḥ. B. I. Text.
A.S.M.I.	Agrarian System of Moslem India.
A.S.R.	Archaeological Survey Report; Cunningham.
B.	Budāūnī; B. I. Text; tr. Ranking and Lowe.
B.B.R.A.S.	The Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.
B.G.	Bombay Gazetteer.
B.I.	Bibliotheca Indica.
B.M.C.	British Museum Catalogue.
B.N.	Babūr Nāma; tr. A. S. Beveridge.
B.N. or Bād. Nām.	Bādshāh Nāma.
C.H.I.	Cambridge History of India.
C.I.	Chronology of India; Duff.
C.M.S.D.	Coinage and Metrology of the Sultans of Delhi; H. N. Wright.
Constable	Constable's Atlas.
Defrémery	Ibn Baṭṭūṭā; tr. by.
Dorn	History of the Afghans.
E.D.	Elliot and Dowson; History of India as told by its own historians.
Epig. Ind.	Epigraphia Indica.
Ethé I.O.C.	See I.O.L.C.
E.H.I.	Early History of India; V. A. Smith.
E.T.I.	Early Travels in India; ed. [Sir] W. Foster.

F. or Firishta	Tārīkh-i-Firishta; Lithograph ed.; Nawal Kishore Press; tr. Briggs.
Gibb	Ibn Baṭṭūṭā.
Hādī	Dībācha and Tatimma-i-Tūzuk-i-Jahāngīrī.
H.A.	History of Aurangzeb; [Sir] J. N. Sarkar.
H.B.H.	History of Baber and Humayun; W. Erskine.
Herklots	Qānūn-i-Islām; tr. by.
H.I.	History of India; M. Elphinstone; ed. Cowell; 1866.
H.M.	History of the Mahrattas; Grant Duff; reprint 1873.
H.N.	Humāyūn Nāma. Text and tr. by. A. S. Beveridge.
Ḥ.S.	Ḥabību-s-Sīyar.
H.S.M.N.	Historical Studies in Mughal Numismatics; S. H. Hodivala.
I.A.	India of Aurangzeb; [Sir] J. N. Sarkar.
I.G.; Imp. Gaz.	Imperial Gazetteer of India; 1908.
I.N.	Iqbālnāma-i-Jahāngīrī; B. I. Text.
Ind. Ant.	Indian Antiquary.
Ind. Eph.	Indian Ephemeris; L. D. Swamikannu Pillai.
I.O.L.C.	India Office Library Catalogue.
Iqb. Nām.	Iqbālnāma-i-Jahāngīrī; B. I. Text.
Ishtakhrī	Tr. De Goeje.
J.A.S.B.	Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.
J.R.A.S.	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society (of Great Britain).
J.O.L.C.	See I.O.L.C.
Kāmil	Kāmilu-t-Tawārīkh.
Kh. Kh.	See M.L.
L.M.	Later Mughals; W. Irvine.
M.'Ā.	Maāṣir-i-'Ālamgīrī; B. I. Text.
Marco Polo	See Yule.
M.F.L.Ms.	Mullā Fīrūz Library Manuscript.
M.G.	Maḥmūd of Ghazna; M. Nāẓim.
M.L.	Muntakhabu-l-Lubāb; B. I. Text.
M.T.	Muntakhabu-t-Tawārīkh; B. I. Text.
M.U.	Maāṣiru-l-Umarā; B. I. Text.
N.S.	New Style.

O.S.	Old Style.
P.O.	Post Office.
Proc. A.S.B.	Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.
Quellen	Kitābu-l-'Ajāyabu-l-Hind; tr. by.
R. and B.	Raverty and Beveridge
Races	Races of the North Western Provinces; H. M. Elliot; ed. J. Beames.
Rieu	See B. M. C.
Sardesai	Marathi Riyasat; New Edition.
Shams	See T. F.
S.I.M.H.	Studies in Indo-Muslim History; S. H. Hodivala.
S.M.	Sīyaru-l-Mutakhirīn.
Storia	Storia Do Mogor; Manucci; ed. W. Irvine.
Ṭ.A.	Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī; Nawal Kishore Press; 1292 A.H.
T.F.	Tārīkh-i-Fīrūzshāhī; Shams-i-Sirāj or Baranī; B. I. Text.
Thornton	East India Gazetteer.
T.J.	Tūzuk-i-Jahāngīrī; ed. [Sir] Sayyid Ahmad.
T.J.K.N.	Tārīkh-i-Jahān-Kushā-i-Nādirī.
T.M.	Tārīkh-i-Mubārakshāhī; B. I. Text.
Ṭ.N.; Ṭab. Nāṣ.	Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī. B. I. Text.
T.R.; Tār. Rash.	Tārīkh-i-Rashīdī. B. I. Text.
T.S.	Tārīkhu-l-Sindh.
Yule	Marco Polo's Travels.
Z.A.	Zainu-l-Akhbār.
Ẓ.N.	Ẓafar-Nāma; Sharfu-d-dīn Yazdī; B. I. Text.
Ẓ.W.	Ẓafara-l-Wālih; ed. Sir E. Denison Ross.

STUDIES IN INDO-MUSLIM HISTORY

BEING

NOTES ON

ELLIOT AND DOWSON'S HISTORY OF INDIA

AS TOLD BY

ITS OWN HISTORIANS

EARLY ARAB GEOGRAPHERS

I. 9, *l.* 13 from foot. *Some of the Kings of India, when they ascend the throne, have a quantity of rice cooked and served on banana leaves....All those who eat the rice are obliged, when the King dies, or is slain, to burn themselves to the very last man on the very day of of the King's decease. This is a duty which admits of no delay.*

The Arab author of the *Kitāb-al-'ajāib al Hind* gives some further details about this custom. He says : "The Kings of India have about their persons a company of men....These men say to the King, 'We are your 'balandjers'. He makes them eat rice with him and gives them betel from his own hand. Each hacks off his little finger, and sets it before the King'. And from that moment on, they follow him about wherever he goes, eat what he eats, and drink what he drinks....If he dies, they commit suicide. If he burns, they cast themselves into the flames; if he falls ill, they mishandle themselves in order to share his sufferings".

He also tells a curious story to illustrate the great vogue and tyranny of this strange institution. "One of the great Kings of India", he writes, "was sitting down, taking a meal. Before him was a parrot in a cage. Said the King, 'Come and eat with us'. 'I am frightened of cats', replied the parrot. 'No matter', answered the King, 'I will be your *balandjer*'....So the King took and ate a little of the parrot's rice, ...and the bird set himself at table with the King. Along came a cat, and snapped off the parrot's head. Then the King had the parrot's body embalmed and carried it about wherever he went for several years. At last his *balandjers* and important subjects of the Kingdom approached him and said 'Your behaviour is unseemly and has gone on too long. Do your duty, or we shall be obliged to arrange for your deposition and take another King'. So the King flung himself into a fire-pit and

was burned, and his *balandjers* jumped in and were burned with him to the number of two thousand. And all this came about because the King had said to his parrot, 'I am your *balandjer*'." Tr. Quellen, 99–101. The symbolical cutting off of the finger which is mentioned by this author is also an interesting novelty.

> Marco Polo also mentions this custom in connection with the Kingdom of Sonder Bandi Davar, *i.e.* Sundara Pāṇḍya of Madūra. "This King hath some five hundred wives.…And there are about the King a number of barons in attendance upon him;…they are called the King's Trusty Lieges. And you must know that when the King dies and they put him on the fire to burn him, these Lieges cast themselves into the fire round about his body, and suffer themselves to be burnt along with him. For they say, …they ought to keep him in company in the other world also". (Tr. Yule, (Edit. 1903), II. 339).

Indeed, it would appear that all the ruling dynasties of Southern India, the Cholās, Chālukyas and Hoysalas retained suicide-squads in their service, who were called *Garuḍas*, from the devotion of that bird to its master, the god Vishnu. The epigraphic records of the Hoysalas are especially full of references to these men (Rice, Epigraphia Carnatica, Vol. V, 71–74). Perhaps the most vivid and remarkable of such records is a pillar in the Hoysaleshwara temple at Halebid, in which a thousand Garuḍas headed by the Prince Lakshma are depicted taking their own lives in various ways by the sword, the dagger and by head-swinging after the death of the King Ballāla II. The Prince Lakshma was his prime minister. The institution is known to have existed in Madūra and is spoken of as *Tennavan Āppatuda-vigal* in the Tamil inscriptions of the Pāṇḍya Kings. See Archæological Report on Epigraphy (Madras) 1918 Part ii, Para 43; K. A. N. Sāstri, Pandya Kingdom 19.

It is recorded in the Jodhpur annals, that when Ajitsingh was murdered by his sons, not only 84 *Satīs*, but several "men devoted themselves on his pyre." (Tod, A.A.R. I. 744). There was a similar sacrifice at the funeral of the Sikh Gurū Hargovind in 1645. *Dabistān al Maẕāhib*. Tr. Shea and Troyer, II. 280; J. D. Cunningham, History of the Sikhs, p. 62.

The cutting off of the little finger also is a fact and is mentioned in a Kannaḍa inscription of the Chālukyan age. (B. L. Rice, *Epigraphia*

Carnatica, VII. SK. 152). Two other Arab writers also mention it as an old Hindu custom, in connection with the invasions of Maḥmūd of Ghazna.

Ibn Ẓafīr states in his *Akhbāru-l-Dawal,* (written about the beginning of the seventh Hijri century), that when a Hindu King was defeated and made peace with his conqueror, he cut off the tip of one of his fingers, which the victor kept as a trophy, and that, for this reason, the Sultān possessed a number of the finger-tips of Hindu Rājās whom he had vanquished. One of those who had to do this was the Rājā of Kālinjar. This particular instance is mentioned by Ibn al Athīr also (*Kāmil,* IX. 133, under the year 414 H). There is a reference to the custom as well as to the case of Nanda (or Ganda) in the Chronicle of Sibt ibn al Jauzī, who cites it from a collection of Letters of Victory (فتحنامه), addressed by Maḥmūd to the Khalīf Qādirbillah. I am indebted for the references to the unpublished works of these Arab authors to Dr. M. Nāẓim's Maḥmūd of Ghazna. Appendix L. pp. 207–8.

The ceremony was in fact symbolical of a pledge or solemn promise, on the part of the giver, of unconditional obedience or fidelity and readiness to sacrifice his own life and fight to the death for the victor. This is exactly what the *Balanjārīya* were, by their vow, inexorably bound to do.

It will be seen that almost everything stated by the old Arab authors, who were the first to draw our attention to this strange custom, is founded on fact. But the derivation of the name still remains a puzzle. I venture to offer with great diffidence a suggestion which has occurred to me after reading the judicious and informative article written by Dr. Venkataramannayya in the Journal of Oriental Research, Vol. XIV, Part II. It appears that these people were called 'Velāikkāran', that is, 'men who were bound by a covenant'. The Arabs seem to have casually picked up this word by the ear and then shaped it, as foreigners do, by way of meaning-making, into *balanjārīya*, from 'Biranj'–the Persian word for *'rice'*, which they ate as a symbol of the sacrament. Dr. Venkataramannayya states that these persons were also known as 'Jolīkkāra', because they received their remuneration in *Jolī* or *Cholam*, that is, 'millet'. (*Loc. cit.* 97, 98, 101, 103; see also K. A. N. Shāstri, Cholas. II. 225 and the authorities quoted there). **I beg it to be understood that this derivation is only a surmise on which no stress is intended to be laid.**

I. 10, *l.* 14. ***The Kingdom of Sarandīb has a law, and its doctors assemble from time to time....The Indians go to the doctors and write from their dictation the lives of the prophets, and the precepts of the law.***

This reference to the Buddhist Councils is interesting. They were held every five years and were known as the *Panchvarshā* or *Panchvarshikā Parishad*. They are said to have been instituted by Asoka and on these occasions, there were recitations of the Law and offerings were made to the priesthood. (Fa Hiān in Beal, Records, I. XXVIII; Hiuen Tsiang, *Ibid*. I. 21, 52 and Notes).

I. 13, *l.* 17. ***The elephants are generally about nine cubits high, except those of Anāb, which are ten and eleven cubits.***

I have pointed out in the note on this passage in S. I. M. H. p. 13, that the true reading is اغباب, the plural of غب, estuary.

The author of the *'Ajāibu-l-Hind'* mentions the 'Sea of *Gobbs*' (غب), as the translator somewhat ignorantly styles it, very frequently. "There is in the valley of Serendib", he writes, "a great city.…Here are *Gobbiya* fabrics, beautiful and of great price. The town is built on the banks of a great river, which flows into the Sea of *Gobbs*". (Tr. Peter Quennell, p. 5). Elsewhere, he speaks of "the Sea of the *Gobbs* of Serendib which measures three hundred *purasangs* long and which is very difficult and dangerous and where navigation is a troublesome business." (*Ibid*. p. 98. See also p. 33 where the '*Gobbs* of Serendib' are again referred to and p. 104). This proves conclusively that the spelling اغياب in the Paris text of Mas'ūdī's *Murūj* is an error.

I. 14, *l.* 6 from foot. ***There is a road through the city of Karkūz, leading to the eastern countries from Persia.***

Dowson notes that this passage is not found "in the Paris version" and that "Quatremère proposed to read 'Hormuz' for Karkūz". But the emendation appears to be unnecessary and the statement itself is correct.

This Karkūz is the 'Karkūyah' of the Arab geographers. It was situated one stage north of Zaranj and the northern gate of that ancient capital of Sīstān was called the Bāb-i-Karkūya. Yāqūt says that it was peopled by Khārijites in his time, but it was chiefly remarkable for its great fire temple, which was greatly venerated by all the Magians of Persia. Qazvīnī also gives a long account of the building which was said to date from the times of Rustam. The fire temple is the *Mino-Kerko* which is mentioned along with three other great fire temples

called Ādar Gushasp, Ādar Khurdād and Ādar Burzinmihr in a Pazand paragraph appended to the *Ātash Nyāish.* It is explained in the Revayet of Shāpur Bharūchi that it had been installed in the Raiwand mountain of the Dasht-i-Vishtāspān and that it had the extraordinary property of burning perpetually without any sort of fuel and of being incapable of extinction by water. (Revāyet of Dārāb Hormazdyār, Edit. M. R. Unwāllā (I. 72, l. 6; Trans. B. N. Dhābar p. 60 and note 3).

The road referred to by Khurdādbih is more fully described by other writers. Starting from Herāt, it passed through Asfuzār (Sabzvār), Farāh, Juvayn, *Karkuyāh*, Zaranj, (where all the roads in Sijistān met), then to Narmāshīr, Fannazbūr, Armabīl and Debal. (Lestrange, Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, 331-2, 341-2, 351 and Map VIII). Qazvīnī also states that the *Shahr-i-Sīstān* was fifteen stages [مرحله] or 60 or 80 *Farsangs* from Herāt and that Karkūyeh was four *farsangs* on the other side of the Hirmand river and three *farsangs* from the Shahr i Sīstān [Zanjān]. (*Nuzhat-ul-Qutūb*, Edit. Lestrange, 178, l. 4 f. f.).

I. 15, *l.* 16. ***From Sind are brought the costus, canes and bamboos.***

M. Barbier de Meynard understands Khurdādbih to say that these commodities are ***produced in*** Sind. "Le Sind ***produit*** le Koust, le rotang et le bambou" (Journal Asiatique, 1865, p. 283). De Goeje also translates the sentence in the same way.

I have pointed out in the note on this passage in S. I. M. H. p. 16, that bamboos do not and cannot grow or be 'produced' in the climate of Sind and the same remark applies to costus. It is the Sans. ***Kustha*** and is "a product of the Himālaya, in the vicinity of Kashmir and is a chief ingredient in the Chinese pastille-rods, commonly called 'Josticks' or 'Joss sticks'. It has been an article of export from the ports on the Western Coast, and is still sent from Bombay and Calcutta to the Malay Archipelago and to China". (Yule, Hobson Jobson, *s. v.* Putchock).

It is not easy to say what Khurdādbih really meant. He had no personal knowledge of Sind and he merely jotted down a few odds and ends which he had heard or picked up from books or the reports of travellers. He had probably seen these exotic products in the course of his official duties or in the markets of Khurāsān. He might have been informed that they had come from Debal, and he might have more or less ignorantly imagined that they were "produced in Sind", because Debal was the port and emporium of that country.

Another point worth noting in connection with this passage is that Abūl Fedā transfers these products "costum, cannam et arundinem" to *Sindān*. (Gildemeister De Rebus Indicis. Text. 46, l. 13=Tr. 188).

I. 17, *l.* 2. ***In Hind, there are fortytwo religious sects. Idrīsī repeats this (E. D. I. 76), but 'A Awfī' makes the number forty-eight.***

Introduction to the Jawāmi'au-l-Ḥikāyāt (p. 248, story 1971).

The discrepancy is perhaps due to ثنتين having been read as ثمن, or *vice versa*. The confusion is common in Arabic writing.

I. 29, *l.* 4 from foot. *The length of Makrān from Tīz to Kasrān is about fifteen days.*

'Kasrān' is an undoubted error here for 'Qusdār'. De Goeje reads قصدار (Iṣṭakhrī, 179, l. 3). Ibn Ḥauqal has the same reading in the counterpart passage (E. D. I. 39).

The approximate distance between Quṣdār and Tīz, as measured on the Map is about five hundred miles. Tīz is approximate Lat. 25°-15′ N., Long. 60°-15′ E. Quṣdār (Kozdar of Constable. Pl. 26 A b) in Lat. 27°-45′ N., Long. 67°-15′ E.

I. 71, *l.* 7. ***Opposite Lamuri, is the island of Lakwāram, which produces plenty of red amber.***

Elliot notes that "the early Arabian geographers speak of these islands as 'Lanjābalūs' and that the allusion may be made to the Nicobars". The old Hindu name of this group is 'Nakkavāram' and it occurs in the great Tānjore inscription of the 11th Christian Century. Marco Polo calls them 'Necuveran' (Travels, Book III, Ch. 12), Odoric has 'Nicoveran' (Cathay, 97) and Barbosa 'Niconvaı' (Tr. Stanley, 195). See Yule, Hobson Jobson, Ed. Crooke, 624. 'Lanjābalūs' seems to be the Arabicised form of نکبا روس with the definite article 'Al' prefixed and the 'r' changed into 'l', a common consonantal mutation. 'Nakbārūs' is evidently derived from 'Nakkavāram', which has been traced to the Sanskrit 'nagna', naked. The nudity of the inhabitants is mentioned by almost all the old writers. Sulaimān calls them 'Lankhā Balūs', but this form is probably due to ج having been wrongly read as خ, and to some sort of etymological confusion with 'Lankā' which means 'island' in Sanskrit. A still stranger perversion is found in the 'Island of the Bell or Nāqūs', لنکا ناقوس, to which Sindbād is carried in his Fifth Voyage (Burton, Tr. *Alf Laila*, IV. 368).

I. 83, *l.* 2 from foot. ***Kirkāyān is a district known by the name of Ail. ...It bears the name of Ail, because a man of that name conquered it (in ancient times).***

There is some error here. Idrīsī is copying from Iṣṭakhrī and he must mean 'Kandaīl' or 'Kandābīl' of which the earlier author states that it lies "within the confines of Budha" and that "Abīl is the name of the man who subdued the town which is named after him" (E. D. I. 29). Only Idrīsī calls him *Ail* and changes 'Budha' into 'Nadha'. Ibn Ḥauqal also observes that "the city where the Budhites carry on their trade is Kandābīl" (Ibid. 38).

I. 86, *l.* 20. ***In the Rānah, the Kings are called Fanjab.***

This is a good example of the strange forms which names assume when copied carelessly by one writer from another. Idrīsī's رانج is a blunder for زانج. Khurdādbih states that the King of Zābaj is called 'Fanjab' or (Al) *Fīkat* or *Fīkhat* ال فيكت or ال فيخت [فتجب? Fatjab?] *Journal Asiatique*, 1865, pp. 45 and 257; E. D. I. 13, l. 7 and my note in S. I. M. H. 12.

I. 84 last line. ***There is [in Kambāya], a fine fortress erected to prevent the inroads of the inhabitants of the island of Kīsh.***

I have suggested that this Kīsh may stand for Kachh, but Idrīsī himself must mean the island in the Persian Gulf, as he says elsewhere that "the people of India dread the King of Qais and only resist him by the aid of ships known as *Meshīat*, which although made of a single piece of wood, are capable of carrying 200 men." (Quoted by Sir Arnold Wilson, in The Persian Gulf, p. 98). This is repeated by Yāqūt who remarks that "the King of Qais is held in respect by the sovereigns of India on account of his naval forces and riches" (*Ibid*, 99).

I. 95, *l.* 2. ***The 'Bahru-l-buldān' is not a distinct work, but is a Persian translation of the 'Āsāru-l-Bilād', well known in the world by the name of 'Ajāibu-l-buldān', written in Arabic by Kazwīnī.***

There are two recensions of Qazvīnī's work. The earlier is called '*Ajāibu-l-Buldān*, and it is the work mentioned by Casiri, as having been written about 661 A. H. The '*Āṣāru-l-bilād*' is a considerably enlarged and altered edition of the same work and it is the one referred to by Ḥājji Khalfā and edited by Wustenfeld. (Houtsma, E. I *s. v.* Kazvīnī).

I. 102, *l.* 10 from foot. ***Kūsh-pīl-dandān.***

This must be the hero of one of the many cyclical romances which were composed after Firdausī's death. 'Gūsh-pīl' means 'elephant-ears', and 'Gūsh pīl bistar' was the name of a savage whose body 'neath its fell, seemed indigo, his ears like elephant's in breadth'. Sikandar

came across him when he marched towards Bâbil (Babylon). (*Shâhnâma*, Tr. Warner, VI. 177). These people who "sleep upon one ear and use the other as a coverlet (*bistar*)" are the *Karṇapravaraṇâs* of the *Mahâbhârata* (*II. 1170, 1875*). The story is found also in the Pseudo-Callisthenes, (Bk. III. Ch. 28). See also Wheeler, History of India, III. 179.

I. 119, *l.* **2.** *Dâhir replied, they are pirates who have captured these women, and over them I have no authority.*

Sir H. Elliot observes in the Appendix (p. 429) that these pirates are variously described as 'Meds' by Bilādurī, as 'Tankāmara' in the Chachnāma, and as 'Nankāmarā' or 'Nagāmra' in the *Tuḥfatu-l-Kirâm*. He thinks it possible that the name is 'Sangāmara' and then proceeds to surmise that they may be "Sangāniāns or Sangārs, who for centuries have committed their ravages on the shores of Sind and Guzerāt until their total suppression under our Government" (*Ibid* p. 430). These conjectures are both far-fetched and unsustainable, as the name 'Sangāniān' can be proved to be of comparatively recent origin (*vide* my note on E. D. VII. 355, l. 4 in S. I. M. H. 661) and the existence of a piratical tribe called *Najâmra* in Sind itself is borne witness to by Captain MacMurdo about a hundred years ago :

"In the Delta of the Indus and near the sea shore, still enjoyed independence, about 1738 A.D., namely the Jam of Kakrala, a branch of the Samma family, and Rana Ajmal of Dhareja, by caste a *Najamra*, a descendant of a family which had preserved its inheritance, through the many vicissitudes to which the province of Sind had been subject for several centuries. These chieftains had the command of the principal branches of the river Indus, in which their vessels exercised unlimited authority and levied revenues arising from the trade passing up the streams. Whether the desire of adding to the revenue of the province or, as is affirmed by some others, to punish some acts of aggression which had been committed by the boats on the river, led to the attack on the Chieftains is not very clear, but the Sahibzadas Muradyab Khan and Ghulam Shah Khan, sons of Khudayar Khan Kalhora, had hardly reached Tatta, when they declared war with the Kakralla and Dhareja Chiefs".

Art. on the History of the Kalhora family of Sind from the papers of Capt. James MacMurdo written by Dr. J. Bird in the B. B. R. A. S. Journal, Vol. I (1844), p. 416.

I. 126, *l.* 12. ***This water was called 'Buffalo-water', because buffalos took refuge there from the bears which infested the banks of the Mihrān.***

As the word used, دباب, has been understood by Elliot as 'bears', by Reinaud as 'wolves' and by Dr. Murgotton as 'blue flies', it may be worth while to quote the following remarks of an old traveller, which may throw light on the real meaning. "There is one evil in Sinde, connected with the irrigation of the river, that must not be forgotten; it is the plague of gnats which are engendered by the mud, when the inundation recedes. The torments of these insects are, in places, so formidable that whole villages and communities residing immediately on the river are obliged to emigrate, and the largest animals of the country, buffalos, camels or horses would be soon destroyed, if exposed to their constant attacks. This insect is a very small sandfly or midge, far worse than the mosquitoe, in its quality of tormentor, for the enemy is too small to resist by ordinary methods and penetrates irresistibly." Mrs. Postaus, Personal Observations on Sindh, (1843), pp. 19–20. We may fairly presume that the creatures from whose torments the buffalos sought refuge in this pool were these gnats or sand-flies. We have in Dr. Murgotten's 'blue flies' such a close approach to the description given by Mrs. Postaus, that we may safely prefer his interpretation to the others. Other old travellers in Sind also complain bitterly of the stagnant pools in which mosquitoes and sandflies are bred in "countless myriads" and "number infinite" (Eastwick, Dry Leaves from Young Egypt (1849), pp. 30–31).

I. 138, *l.* 15. ***The boundaries of his [Chach's] dominions extend on the east to Kashmīr, on the west to Makrān, on the south to the shores of the ocean and to [Debal, and on the north to the mountains of Kardān and to] Kaikānān].***

Mīr M'aṣūm has copied this sentence, attempting to make it intelligible to his contemporaries, he has paraphrased or rather transmogrified it thus :

"On the east they extended to Kashmīr and Qanauj, on the west to Makrān and the shore of the Ocean, where is the port of Debal, and is now known as the port of Lāhrī; on the south to the limits of the ports of Sūrat and Dīv, and on the north to the frontiers of Qandahār and Sīstān, the mountains of Sulaimān and Kardān and Kaikānān." (*Tārīkh-i-Sind*, Edit. Dr. U. M. Dāūdpotā, p. 8. l. 18).

His summary of the *Chachnāma* differs so much in many important points from the printed text and from all known manuscripts, that it must have been based on an exceedingly faulty copy or made very carelessly.

I. 143, *l.* 6 from foot. ***When he [Chach] took the fort of Multān,...he went into the temple, prostrated himself before the idols and offered sacrifices.***

چون حصار ملتان مسلم شد... خود به بتخانهٔ مزروی رفت وبت را سجده کرد و صدقها داد

(*Chachnāma*, Edit. Dr. U. M. Dāūdpota, 37, l. 7).

This word مزروی or مترروی and مسترروی , as it is written in other manuscripts, is worthy of notice. It occurs again in connection with the temple to the Sun which is described thus :

وبرآن بالا بتخانه است بتی دروی نشانده است از زر سرخ وگرد آن حوض درختان برنشانده است مسترروی

Variant مترروی, *Ibid*, 239, l. 6 from foot.

"And over it, there is a temple, and in it he [King Jaswīnt] has installed an idol of red gold and planted round the tank trees from the *Mitravan.*"

I venture to suggest with some confidence that the right reading is neither مزروی nor مترروی nor مسترروی but مترونی. The *Mitravan* was the Forest of Mitra or the Sun-god. The Purānic story is that Krishṇa destroyed the Asur Bāna and wrested from him the Kingdom of Multān. Here Sāmba, the son of Krishṇa, established himself in the grove of Mitravana, and by assiduous devotion to Mitra, or the "Sun", was cured of his leprosy. He then erected a golden statue of Mitra, in a temple named Ādyasthāna or the "First Shrine." : Cunningham, Ancient Geography of India, Edit. S. N. Majumdār, p. 267. See also Wilford, Asiatic Researches, XI-69: H. H. Wilson in Reinaud, Mémoire sur l'Inde, 392; H. H. Wilson, Vishnu Purāṇa Works, Ed. Rost, X. 381.)

We may then take it that the trees were 'Mitravanī', because they had been brought from the 'Mitravan', or grove sacred to the Sun-god. See the note on E. D. I. 205, l. 7 from foot in S. I. M. H. p. 98.

I. 162, *l.* 14. *Kākā said, 'Granting a seat,...and tying a turban round the head is our ancestors' mode of bestowing honour.'*

This is a genuine trait or characteristic of ancient Hindu manners. We read in the *Kathā Sarit Sāgara,* that "the King, the Brāhmans, and the merchants···made a proclamation that whoever had made a fool of

the *Kuṭṭinī* (bawd, named Makaradanshtra), who had deceived innumerable lovers, was to show himself and he would receive a turban of honour on the spot." (Tr. Tawney, I. 82; Edit. Penzer, I. 148). See also *Ibid*, p. 95; Penzer, I. 184, where the King of Vatsa is said to have "invested Gopālaka and Pulindaka with turbans of honour and other distinctions".

I. 166, *l.* 10. *Rāi Dāhir confers with the Sāmānī, his minister, on Muhammad Kāsim's preparations for crossing the river.*

There are some statements in this passage which when properly interpreted and elucidated, seem to me to be of very great interestf The minister informs his master that there are three courses open to him. He may either face the enemy and attack him or collect all his forces and retreat in good order to the Sandy Desert with a view to seek the help of its chiefs against the Arabs or he should take all his property and his followers to the territory of *Jaswam.* [جسم] "That prince", he declares, "knows you very well and will help you in every way. When you have managed to secure his assistance, you need not fear that any enemy will jeopardise the safety of your Kingdom and as long as that King is alive, the enemy [the Arabs] cannot but be foiled." (Kalich Beg's Trans. of the *Chachnāma*, p. 122).

The historical importance of the allusion lies in the name of the King who is called جسم راى in the printed Text. (153, l. 3 from foot). The manner in which the King is spoken of points to the real name being *Jaswaram* or *Jasoram* جسورم. Now the most powerful Kingdom in 712 A.C. was that of Qanauj, and the ruling prince was named *Yashovarman.* The exact year of his accession has not been ascertained, but he is known to have been the patron of Bhavabhūti and also of Vākpatirāja, who flourished in the first half of the 8th century. He sent an embassy to China in 731 A.C. (Chavannes, *Les Turcs Occindentaux*, p. 166, note 7) and was defeated by Lalitāditya Muktāpiḍa of Kashmīr about 740 (Stein, Trans. *Rājatarangiṇī*, Bk. IV. verses 133-146; V. Smith, Early History of India, Edit. 1908, p. 349 note; Duff, Chronology of India, 58, 62, 63).

This is what is known with anything resembling certainty about him. Chronology is the weak spot in ancient Hindu history; all dates are tentative and more or less conjectural, and at best approximate and liable to revision. Dr. R. P. Tripāthi supposes him to have reigned from 725 to 752 A.C. (History of Kanauj, p. 197). Mr. Vincent Smith was in favour of 728 to 745, while all that S. P. Pandit could conclude

after an elaborate investigation was that he must have ruled in "the latter part of the seventh and the first part of the eighth century" (Gauḍavaho, Intro. xcv–vi).

There is nothing to show that he was not on the throne of Qanauj in 712 A.C. and this reference to him in this contemporary Arab chronicle is not only interesting but may serve to throw another side-light on the still undecided question of the real date of his accession or the commencement of his reign.

I. 197, *l*. 18. *Jaisīya goes to Kūraj.*

Kūraj is most probably the same as the 'Kīraj' of Bilādurī, who also speaks of the King as being named Dūhar[Dhruva]. Sir H. Elliot says in his notes in the Appendix (p. 391), that it must be meant for 'Kachh', but that geographical expression is of very recent origin and is not found anywhere in the older historical or geographical literature. I venture to suggest that 'Kūraj' may be meant for 'Gūrjar' and that the Kingdom to which Jaisiya went was that of Valabhī. Its rulers were 'Gurjars' and the name of the King reigning in 713 A.C. is said in the inscription to have been Shilāditya V (701–722 A.C.). But the last six Kings of this dynasty were *all* styled 'Shilādityās', although each of them must have had a personal name of his own. We know that Shilāditya I was named Dharmāditya and it is not unlikely that the original name of Shilāditya V was Dhruva, as Bilādurī says that the King of 'Kīraj' was called 'Dūhar' (E. D. I. 124). The name of Shilāditya VII is stated to have been Dhrubhaṭa (Epigraphia Indica, Vol. VIII).

I. 216, *l*. 15. *He directed his efforts against the country of Kachh and extended his sway as far as Mānik Bāi.*

There are many variants ناکنئی , ناک نی , ناکی (*Tārīhh-i-Sind*, Text, 61, l. 7 and foot-note; Mullā Firuz Library, Ms. 39b. l. 2). Malet calls it 'Manik Nai'. Mīr M'aṣūm mentions it elsewhere also in connection with Muḥammad Tughlaq's pursuit of the rebel Taghī who, he says, had fled and taken refuge with the Jhārejas. He states that the Sulṭān

عزم ناکنی فرموده بجانب تهته متوجه شد و در موضع تهری بکنار
آب نزول نموده اقامت فرمود

M. F. S. Ms. folio 30a, l. 12; T. S. 48, l. 13.

"Resolved to march to *Nāgnai* and proceed to Thatta. He halted at the village of Tharī on the bank of a river".

Here also the variants are ناکانی and ناکنی. The place meant is, most probably, Nāgan-(or Kachh Nāgan)-the old village on the site of which Jām Rāwal founded his new capital called Nawānagar or Jāmnagar. It satisfies all the conditions required. It was in Kachh at this time, and appears to have formed the eastern boundary of the Sūmra dominions. *Vide* my note on E. D. I. 296, l. 16 in S. I. M. H. 123.

I. 232, *l.* 20. ***When Sanjar became ruler, there was a Kāzi in Bhakkar, who had been appointed... by a former King.***

In the printed Text, the name of this bribe-master is explicitly given as 'M'arūf'. قاضی معروف نام شخصی (T. S. 73, l. 6). Malet also calls him 'Mauroof' (p. 54) and so also Kalīch Beg in his translation of this chapter. (History of Sind. II. 49).

I. 234, *l.* 2. ***The Jām sent a large force to repel this attack of the Mughals and it advanced as far as Dara-Karīb, commonly known by the name of Jalūgar.***

This 'Dara-Karīb' is an imaginary place-name which owes its existence, like several others in Dowson's abstract translations, to misreading or misconstruction.

و آن لشکر تا قریه که مشهور است بجلوگیر رسیده جنگ صعب نمودند

M. F. L. Ms. folio 48 b, l. 11, T. S. 75, l. 10.

"And that army having reached *a village*, which is well-known as Jalūgīr fought a hard battle".

Here قریه 'village' has been turned into 'Karīb'.

I. 237, *l.* 7. ***In Kor-zamīn and Chhatur which are districts of Sīwī, cotton plants grow as large as trees, in so much that men pick the cotton mounted.***

Marco Polo states that in the Kingdom of Guzerāt, "the cotton trees are of very great size, growing full six paces high, and attaining to an age of 20 years.···Upto the age of 12 years, the trees give good spinning cotton, but from that age to 20 years, the produce is inferior" (Tr. Yule. Ed. Cordier, II. 393). Rashīdu-d-dīn also notes that in Guzerāt "the cotton plants grow like willows and plane-trees, and yield produce ten years running". (E.D.I. 67; see also Waṣṣāf, *Ibid.* III. 32).

This may be intended for the *Seemul* or Silk-cotton tree (***Bombax Malabaricum***), but the description is more applicable to the ***Gossypium arboreum*** or ***Gossypium religiosum*** of the Indian botanists. This variety is "often grown in South India near temples or abodes of devotees" and is known as *Dev Kapās* in the vernaculars. The fibre is said to be very fine and is used for the manufacture of turbans and muslins, as

well as Brahmanical threads. The tree grows to a height of between 15 and 20 feet". Yule's Note in *Op. Cit.* II. 394–5.

M'āṣūm's account, however, relates not to Gujarāt or Madras, but to Sībī, where the climatic and agricultural conditions are quite different. The compiler of the Gazetteer of the Province states, in his account of cotton cultivation in the district, that "after the seed has been sown, regular waterings are required, after twelve to twenty days, till October. The plant flowers in August, the boles burst in October and the picking is commenced and continues upto January.…A crop lasts for three years.…A second year's crop is considered the best, both as regards productiveness and quality". Baluchistan Gazetteer, Vol. III (Sībī), pp. 95–96.

I. 237, *l.* 9. ***On each cotton plant, there are one or two hundred snakes, of a span long....If any one is bitten by a snake, they immediately open the wound with a razor and suck out the poison, otherwise death would supervene.***

The picture is somewhat overdrawn. This 'snake' is the 'flying leech'. It is found in Ceylon also and is thus described by Ibn Baṭṭūṭa who calls it العلق الطيار. *Sangsue volante* (Defrémery. IV. 178). "It remains in trees or the grass near water. When any one comes near it, it springs upon him and the part of the body attacked will bleed profusely. People generally provide themselves with a lemon for the occasion, which they squeeze over it and then it drops off. The place upon which the leech has fastened, they cut out with a wooden knife made for that purpose. It is told of a pilgrim who passed by this place that a leech fastened upon him, so that the skin swelled; and as he did not squeeze the lemon upon it, the blood flowed out and he died (Dr. Samuel Lee's Trans. of 1829, p. 188, see also Gibb, 258). Robert Knox (Historical Relation of the Island of Ceylon, Edit. 1817, pp. 48–9) speaks of these pests as "being rather troublesome than dangerous". He says they are "of the nature of our leeches, only differing in colour and bigness, being as big as a goose-quill and in length some two or three inches". The German biologist, Haeckel, also observes that the "much-to-be-execrated land-leeches of Ceylon" are to be found on every bush and tree, from which they frequently drop on to the head or neck of the passer-by", and stigmatises them as "one of the most untolerable curses of this beautiful island, of all its plagues the worst, as I was afterwards to learn by much suffering." (A Visit to Ceylon, Trans. Clara Bell, 1883, p. 138).

I. 238, *l.* 1. ***Between Sīwī, Dehra and Kasmūr there is a tract of land called Bargān.***

In the printed Text of M'aṣūm's History, the names are read as Sīwī, *Bhakkar* and *Sītpūr* (T. S. 129, l. 18) and the Manuscript in the M. F. L. also is in agreement with it (folio 83, a, l. 2).

I. 238, *l.* 16. ***The hills of Sitūr and the river Ābkashīda run in a sort of semi-circle from Sīwī to Ganjāva. Between these places, there is a waste through which the road to Kandahār runs.***

و آن سرزمین سیوي و گنجابہ این چنین واقع است کہ کوہ سیتپور و کنار آب کشیدہ تا موضع کین و سیوی و پاتر رسیدہ و از آنجا نصف دائرہ درست کردہ باز بکنار دریا رسیدہ و درمابین ھمہ دشت است و راہ قندھار از میان آن دشت واقع است

T. S. 130, l. 13; M. F. L. Ms. folio 83 a, l. 14.

Dowson says that "the meaning is doubtful" and it is true that the passage is not clearly worded, but no such river as 'Abkashīda' is known and the following is suggested as a revised rendering. "And the districts of Sīwī and Ganjābah are thus situated. They extend along the hills of Sītpūr and the river upto the towns of Kīn, Sīwī and Pātar in such a way as to describe a semi-circle and then again approach the rivers' bank. The space between is entirely desert and the road to Qandahār runs through that desert."

The description is not easily comprehensible, but this is all that I can make of it. This Sitpūr (or Sitūr) cannot be the place of that name which is now in Muzaffargarh district Punjab (Constable Pl. 24Dc). It must be somewhere in Quetta or Sībī.

I. 239, *l.* 6 from foot. ***With the Hazāra tribes near Kandahār, it is not the practice to wear coloured clothes such as white, red and black...nor is there any trade in clothes and shoes of this kind.***

The words for the objects which had no vogue among these Hazārās and with the use of which the tribes were unfamiliar cannot be made out, as there is a lacuna in the Text.

در الوس هزارہ جات قندھار [? زر] سرخ و سفید و سیاہ را رواج نیست سودائی ایشان بر پارچہ و کفش و آنچہ ازین قسم می باشد

(M. F. L. Ms. folio 85 a, l. 2; T. S. 133, l. 5) زر is the Editor's conjecture. "Among the Hazāras of Qandahār, red and white and black [money] is not current. Their bargains are for cloth, shoes and articles of that sort."

The text is faulty in all the Manuscripts. A word has been missed out or miswritten and it is possible to make sense only by supplying it conjecturally and inserting some such word as زر between قند هار and سرخ, as the Editor has done. The meaning seems to be that they barter their own surplus products for manufactured articles from the cities, and purchase textile fabrics, shoes and other articles, giving in exchange for them horses, camels, sheep, wool and other commodities which are available among nomad tribes.

سرخ و سفید (without the addition of زر) is used as an elliptical expression for gold and silver in the M. U. where it is said of Jhujhār Sinha Bundela that he

ابا اهل و عیال و لختی از سرخ و سفید از حصار [اوهن حهم] برآمده
بصوب قلعه دهاموني ...... ره نورد فرار گشت

(Op. Cit. II. 785, l. 5).

I. 241, *l*. 8. ***On Friday, the 2nd of Ramāzān 982 A. H....he [Kisu Khān] crossed the river.***

The date is given as 20th in the T. S. 243, l. 6 and 3rd Ramaẓān 982 in the M. F. L. Ms. folio 142b, l. 7. Calculation shows that 2nd Ramaẓān was Thursday, 16th December 1574, 3rd Ramaẓān was Friday, 17th December and 20th Ramaẓān, Monday 3rd January 1575. The correct date must be 2nd (*Rūyyat*) or 3rd (*Bookrule*).

I. 241, *l*. 12 from foot. ***But he [Mujāhid Khān] was greatly dispirited and in consideration of the royal power, he refrained from molesting Kīsū Khān.***

As Dowson says that the text is not clear and the Mss. differ, it may be as well to quote the author's own words

اما ملاحظهٔ پادشاهی نموده تعرض به کیسوخان ننمود

T. S. 243, l. 18.

"But from deep respect for the exalted dignity of the Emperor [whose deputy or duly constituted representative Kīsū Khān was], he did not harass him". Mujāhid Khān did not make any reprisals, because any such action was liable to be misconstrued and misrepresented at Court as an affront to His Majesty.

I. 243, *l*. 10. ***He [the Mir-i-'Adl] fixed by measurement a payment of five*** mans ***per*** bīgha ***on all lands alike.***

از قرار کن کوت بریک بیگه علی التسویه پنج من محصول قرار داد

M. F. L. Ms. folio 144a, l. 10; T. S. 245. l. 15.

'Kankūt' really means, not 'measurement', but "approximate valuation by general inspection of the standing crops". (Moreland, Agrarian System of Moslem India, 232).

The loss of blood which is said to have been the proximate cause of the Mīr's death was due to the opening of his veins by some unskilful barber-surgeon. (T. S. 246, l. 4). It was a common practice in those days for people of a sanguine temperament to be bled annually and the Mīr appears to have fallen a victim to this rage for phlebotomy. Manucci states that the Princes and Princesses were bled twice a year and has much to say about the "customary superstitious observances" attending the operation (Storia, II. 224–5).

I. 244, *l.* 10. ***In the month of Rajab of the same year, the Khān and the other two grantees came to Bhakkar.***

Vide the Note on I. 244, l. 8 in S. I. M. H. 111. There were only two grantees, Fatḥ Khān and Parmānand, the relative of Rājā Todarmal. The words 'Khān and the other' should be deleted. The real meaning is that "the two exalted dignitaries who have been mentioned went to Bhakkar to take charge of the Maḥāls assigned to them".

ودرماه رجب سنه مذکور مسند عالیین مذکورین به بهکر آمده محال متعلقهٔ خود را متعرف شدند

T. S. 247, l. 1, M. F. L. Ms. folio 148a l. 7.

Fatḥ Khān's sobriquet is given variously as مهاوت and as بهادر in the Mss. (T. S. 246, l. 23 and Note), and it is not easy to say which is correct.

I. 245, *l.* 4. ***For Subhān 'Alī Arghūn, Read 'Subḥān Qulī Arghūn.***

Malet has 'Koolee' and it is قلی in M'aṣūm, T. S. 248, l. 5. So, on p. 245, l. 6 from foot read 'Ism'aīl *Qulī* Khān' for 'Ism'aīl Khān'. He was the brother of Ḥusain Qulī Khān, entitled Khān-i-Jahān and the son of Walī Beg Ẕū-l-Qadr (Ṭ. A. Lith. 383, l. 3 from foot; M'aṣūm, T. S. 249, l. 9. Blochmann, *Āīn*. Tr. I. 360). Ḥusain Qulī Khān is the Amīr whose sister is said to have been the wife of Sultān Maḥmūd of Bhakkar. He is wrongly styled 'Jahān Khān' on p. 242, l. 15 from foot.

I. 246, *l.* 8. ***At one period Shaikh Sāngī received charge of the revenues and state business and for a time he visited the shops and took possession of their money and business.***

واویک مرتبہ بجہت اهتمام مال و معاملہ برآمده و مدتی در دکان
نزول آمده مال و معاملہ بوصول رسانیده

T. S. 249, l. 18; M. F. L. Ms. 147 a, l. 2.

"And he [or Malik Sāngī] once in a while used to come out [to dispose of matters connected with] the management of the revenue and administration, and taking up his quarters in a public place (or office), used to recover the land-revenue or taxes due to the State and dispose of civil matters (or business)".

دکان does not mean 'shop' only. It is used for a large room, hall, *e. g.* he writes that Amir Mas'ūd went

از باغ بدکانی رفت و بشراب نشست (Text 617, l. 14).

"from the garden to the ***hall*** and sat down to drink". Elsewhere (157, l. 2) he states that

سالاران محتشم درون این سرای دکانی بود سخت دراز پیش از
بار بنشستندی

See also 345, l. 5, 492, l. 3 ff. and 695, l. 4 for other examples.

I. 247, *l.* 2. ***About this time, His Majesty the Emperor had to make a public example.***

درین اثنا عرق غیرت پادشاهی در حرکت آمد

T. S. 250, l. 18; M. F. L. Ms. folio 147 b, l. 6.

"At this time, the vein of Kingly self-respect [lit. jealousy, honour] throbbed violently". The meaning is that Akbar's innate pride was hurt or wounded. The Emperor regarded Jānī Beg's evasive replies to the summons to come to court and do homage, as a personal affront to himself and a repudiation of the allegiance which the Tarkhāns owed to the Tīmūrides. Mīr Maṣūm uses the phrase in connection with another event also. When it was reported to Shāh Ḥasan Arghūn that Jām Fīroz "had heard with delight the news of the death of his father, Shāh Beg, and beaten drums in token of joy and gratification", he was so highly incensed that he ordered his army to march against Taṭṭa and destroy Jām Fīroz.

عرق غیرت میرزا شاه حسن در حرکت آمده نائره غضب شعلہ زدن گرفت

M. F. L. Ms. folio 81 b. l. 11; T. S. 128, l. 13.

Jām Firoz had, after his defeat in 926 H. sworn allegiance to Shāh Ḥusan's father, Shāh Beg. Compare also the Ṭ. A., where we read

that when Sher Khān heard of Puranmal of Rāīsīn keeping Musalman women in his harem and bidding them dance before him, "the vein of his Islamic pride throbbed violently [عرق حمیت شیر خان در حرکت آمده] and he resolved to conquer Rāīsīn". (Lith. 231, l. 16; B. I. Text, II. 104, l. 2).

I. 247, *l*. 11 from foot. ***His Majesty in his great kindness and consideration gave me a boat and one of his own fur-coats.***

حضرت از کمال مرحمت و بنده پروری بر سر کشتی تشریف شریف ارزانی داشتم و بہ پوستین خاصم سرافراز ساختم بنده را رخصت فرمودند

T. S. 251, l. 15; M. F. L. Ms. 148 a, l. 7.

"And His Majesty having most graciously and kindly presented to me a dress of honour of the highest grade, which was placed in a tray, (?) [کشتی] and also one of his own sheep-skin coats, gave me leave to depart [for my native land]". تشریف means 'dress of honour', of which there were various grades.

I. 247, *l*. 9 from foot. ***And as he [Akbar] dismissed me, he quoted the line..."Sit not down, but travel, for it is very sweet".***

The printed text reads the line *without the negative.*

بنشین و سفر کن کہ بغایت خوبست

T. S. 251, l. 6 from foot. The M. F. L. Manuscript also has نشین (folio 148 a, l. 10).

I. 248, *l*. 8 from foot. ***In fact, when Muhammad Muqīm was sent there he was told that his business was to prevent any danger to the camp on that side.***

الحق آن کنگاش را محمد مقیم یافتہ بود کہ پیش فرستادن توپہا این فایده می کند کہ اُفتی باردو نرسد

M. F. L. Ms. 149 a, l. 1; T. S. 252, l. 19.

"In fact, this plan had been devised (lit. found) by Muḥammad Muqīm. [He said that] the advantage of sending on the cannon in advance [or to the front] was that the camp would receive no injury".

The cannon were planted on the batteries erected on the small extemporised fort of five or six *jaribs*. Muḥammad Muqīm was the *Bakhshi* of the force and senior officer in charge of military operations. As Jānī Beg's plan was to make a three-pronged attack on the Mughal

camp from both sides of the river by land and also by means of a flotilla of 120 boats, Muqīm sought to parry or repel it by intercepting and destroying the ships by a cannonade before they could reach the Khān-i Khānān's camp and co-operate with the two armies attacking it simultaneously on the land-side.

I. 250, *l.* 6. *Saiyid Bahāu-d-dīn [and others] went to Sihwān where many of the defenders were killed.*

سید بہاالدین و .... بر سر سہوان رفتہ سہوان را قبل کردند

M. F. L. Ms. 150 a, l. 4; T. S. 254, l. 13.

They merely *besieged Sihwān.* قبل has been wrongly read as قتل slaughter.

I. 250, *l.* 16 from foot. *Our leaders perceived that if we remained where we were, we might be attacked on every side. Jānī Beg might attack us from the hills, the ghrābs from the river, and the men of Sihwān from the rear.*

This amounts to only three sides and not 'four', as the phrase 'on every side' clearly implies. Dowson's MS would appear to have missed out some words. What the text says is that Jānī Beg was to attack them *in front* (از روبرو), a body of archers or bowmen (جمعی تیراندازان) from the hills, the *ghrābs*, from the river side, and the men of Sihwān from the rear" (از عقب). This makes *four* sides. چہار جانب and fills up the hiatus in the sense. T. S. 255, l. 3; M. F. L. Ms. 150 b, l. 1.

I. 254, *l.* 13. *Dāūd, 'Umar's son, is also styled Sehta, and, from a passage in the Extracts, it will be seen that Jām Sehta, one of the descendants of the Samma refugees, is spoken of as one of the Chiefs of Kach.*

There is some confusion here. When Dāūd, Chief of the *pargana* of Darbela (E. D. I. 253) is styled Sehta, it is because 'Sehta' is the name of a Samma sept or clan which local and family tradition traces to Sahītī, a village of the Naushahro *t'aluqa*, in which they were formerly settled (Aitken, Gazetteer of Sind, I. 187).

This derivation may be unsound, but it is certain that *Jām* Sehta (E. D. I. 268) was so called, not because he belonged to the tribe, but because Sehtā or Satā is the popular or short form of Satarsāl a *personal name* which occurs more than once in the dynastic list of the rulers of Nawānagar.

I. 292, *l.* 5 from foot. *Mīr Kāsim Beg-Lār marries the daughter of Rānā Kūmbā.*

The caption is wrong. He married Rājīa, who was the niece or daughter of the sister of the Rānā (E. D. I. 293, l. 10 from foot). Kumbā or Kumbhā was the son of Wairsī or Baīrīsāl, the Soḍhā Rānā of Amarkot, who gave shelter to Humāyūn and placed his services at the disposal of that Emperor.

I. 301, *l.* 6. *The Mantakkhab-i-bī-badal Yūsufī.*

This must be the *Muntakhabu-t-tawārīkh* compiled by Muhammad Yūsuf al-Atakī-al-Kanʿānī. The author himself explains the *raison d'être* of this alternative designation and states that when it was finished on 15th Zīlḥijja 1056, a friend of his supplied him with a new title, conveying the date of completion, *viz.* منتخب بی بدل 'compendium without peer'. "This implies that 36, the number expressed by the last word (بدل) has to be deducted from 1092, the total formed by the first (منتخب), which indeed gives 1056" (Rieu, Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts in the British Museum, I. p. 123). This work is a Universal History of no particular value. It has attracted some notice only because it contains a list of the Sūmra princes of Sind, which is apparently fuller than that given by M'aṣūm, as it contains 20 names instead of his 12. It is quoted by Sir Henry Elliot in the Appendix at p. 485, but its authenticity is questionable and the additional names are probably faked. Several names which occur only once in Mʿaṣūm's list occur here twice or even thrice.

I. 303, *l.* 19. *When Sultān Abū S'aīd was slain in the battle of Kārābāgh, Amīr Zū-n-nūn retired to his father in Herāt.*

There were two Sultāns who bore this name. This Abū Sʿaīd was a descendant of Tīmūr. He was defeated and captured in a battle with Auzūn Hasan at Qārābāgh and put to death on the 25th of Rajjab 873 H., 8th February 1469 (Rauzatu-s-Safā, Vol. II *Jild* VI. p. 45–46; Beale, *Miftāh*, 125–126; *Tar. Rash.* Tr. 93 note).

The other Abū Sʿaīd, the Ilkhānī, was the son of Uljaitū, and reigned from 716 to 736 A. C. He died of some epidemic which broke out in his camp. Others say that he was poisoned by his wife Baghdād Khātūn, because he fell in love with another woman. *Rauzatu-s-Safā*, Vol. II. *Jild* V. p. 215. l. 3; Miles, *Shajratur Atwāk* Tr. Beale *Miftāh*. 86.1.17.

This author of the *Tarkhân-nâma* has borrowed this statement and almost the whole account from M'asūm's *Tārikh-i-Sind* (80.1.10). Dr. Dāudpota, the editor, accuses (Ibid 308.1.3) that author of having confounded the two Abū S'aīds and cites the authority of Daulatshāh's *Tazkiratu-sh-Shuarā* (Edit. Browne, 478.1.20) the statement that Sultān Abū Said was martyred بشهادت رسانیدند in the desert of Mūqān. But M'asūm is quite right and if there is any error it lies with his editor. The Mīr is quite right in stating that the patron of Zū-n-nūn was Abū S'aīd the Taimūrī, who was put to death after the battle of Qārābāgh in 873 H.

I. 307, *l.* 6 from foot. *This force, on the 7th of Zī-l-K'ada 920 H. (Dec. 1514), attacked and took the villages of Kâkân and Bâghbân.*

But Mīr M'aṣūm, from whom the *Tarkhân Nâma* has borrowed all this, gives the date as 17th Zī-l-q'ad 921 H. (T. S. 110, l. 18; M. F. L. Ms. 72 a, l. 11). Neither date can be correct, if Bābur is right in stating that the news of Shāh Beg's conquest and plundering of Kākān reached him in Rabī'ul awwal 925 (*Tūzuk-i-Bāburī*, Pers. Trans. 149, l. 4; B. N. Tr. 435–6).

I. 308, *l.* 16. *The Emperor Bâbar again...marched upon Kandahâr, and he was yet in the jungle when the fort was invested.*

و محصول در صحرا بود کہ محاصرۂ قندھار واقع شد

M'asūm, T. S. Text, 111, l. 17. M. F. L. Ms. folio 73 a, l. 1. "and the crops were still in the fields [or farms], when the investment of the fortress took place".

I. 308, *l.* 13 from foot. *Shâh Beg...sent the keys of the fort of Kandahâr ...by the hands of Mīr Ghīyâsu-d-dīn, grandson of Khondamīr, author of Habību-s-Siyar, and father of Mīr Abū-l-Makârim and grand father of 'Abdullah Sultân.*

This event is said to have taken place in 923 H. [correctly 928 H.]. The relationship of the envoy to Khwāndamīr seems to have been stated incorrectly. Mīr Ghīyāsu-d-dīn was the *nephew* of Khwāndamīr and not his grandson. The historian himself says so. (*Ḥabību-s-siyar*, Bombay Lith. *Jild* III. *Juzv*. 4, p. 96, 101, 103; Mrs. Beveridge, B. N. Tr. 435). The words corresponding to "grandson of Khwāndamīr" are not found in the M. F. L. Manuscript of M'aṣūm's History and were also conspicuous by their absence from the MSS. collated by

Dr. Dāudpotā (T. S. 112, l. 2). Their insertion is suggested and even recommended by the Editor in a Note on p. 310, l. 4, but it seems safer to make no change than to interpolate error. The statement in the *Tarkhān-Nāma* is a chronological solecism. It is impossible for Khwandamīr to have had a grandson old enough to be employed in important diplomatic transactions in 923 H. Khwāndamīr was born in 880 H. and he must have been only 43 years old in 923 H. (E. D. IV. 141). Any such supposition would be open to doubt even if the year is taken as 928 H.

It is also stated that when "Herāt capitulated to the Uzbeks in 913 H. (1507–8), Khwāndamīr drew up the terms of submission and his nephew (Ghīyāṣu-d-dīn) negotiated the surrender" (E. D. IV. 142).

I. 308 last line. *He left Sultān 'Alī Arghūn and Zībak Tarkhān with a number of men for the protection of the forts of Sīwī and Ganjāwa.*

But Mīr M'aṣūm from whom Saiyid Jamāl, the author of the *Tarkhān Nāma*, has copied all this almost verbatim, spells the name as زینکم here (T. S. Text, 113, l. 5) and زینک at 82, l. 20; 100, l. 15, 104, l. 21.

The name which assumes the form of 'Kaibuk' or 'Kabaik' in Dowson's extracts on pp. 313, 320 is written کیبک (T. S. text, 112, l. 16; 116, l. 15; 118, l. 8) but کبیک and کیبک are noted as variants. (*Ibid*. 112 foot-note). It is probably meant for کپک, the three inferior dots of the پ having been distributed and assigned to ب and ی.

I. 309, *l*. 14 from foot. *Shāh Beg...crossed the river on the 15th day of Muharram A. H. 927 (December 1520).*

The year is given as 926 H. in the printed text of M'aṣūm's T. S. (114, l. 2; M. F. L. Ms. folio 74 a, l. 3 ff.) and also in the translations of Malet and Kalīch Beg (History of Sind. II. 65).

I. 312. *l*. 9. *In the month of Sha'bān 928 H. (June 1522)...Shāh Beg died.*

Mīr M'aṣūm gives the date of the month also *viz*. 22nd (T. S. 127, l. 6, M. F. L. Ms. 81 b, l. 5), *i. e*. 17 July, 1522 A. C.

I. 312, *l*. 9 from foot. *In the meantime, he [Shāh Ḥasan or Ḥusain] received intelligence how that Jām Firoz and the people of Thaṭṭa...had beaten their drums in token of joy and satisfactian [on hearing of Shāh Beg's death].*

There are two not quite consistent versions of this matter in M'aṣūm's own History. In one place, he says nothing at all about this beating of drums. He simply states that the Jām sent envoys to convey his condolence and sympathy on the occasion, but these persons informed Shāh Ḥusain in confidence that Firōz, really entertained very different sentiments in his heart and was collecting men and munitions and secretly preparing for war (T. S. 142, l. 10; M. F. L. Ms. 90 a, l. 4). But in another Chapter (p. 127, l. 12; M. F. L. Ms. 81 b, 10) he relates this story and represents this act of provocative folly as the proximate cause of the invasion of the Jām's territories and the final extinction of his power. The compiler of the *Tarkhān Nāma* has copied this passage, and overlooked the other.

I. 313 last line. *Shaikh Bulākī came from Kandahār to Sind.*

The name is 'Shaikh Mīrak Purānī in Malet's Translation and also in the M. F. L. Ms. Folio 91 a, l. 3 ff. and the Printed Text. (144, l. 15). See also *Ibid*, 168, l. 14; 184, l. 8.

He was appointed Shaikhu-l-Islām of Thaṭṭa by Shāh Ḥusain. Abū-l-Faẓl speaks of him as "the flower of the descendants of Shaikh Purān, whom all the Arghūns reverence and rely upon from all times" (*Akbar Nâma*, I. 173; Tr. I. 363). Shaikh Mīrak's father's name is given by M'aṣūm as Shaikh Abū S'aid Purānī (T. S. 196, l. 19).

I. 314, *l*. 3 from foot. *The Sultān, inflated with pride and puffed up with a certainty of victory, at last arrived at Beg.*

But Mīr M'aṣūm, from whom this entire account is copied almost *verbatim*, says nothing about any place called *Beg*.

What he writes is :

چو بیک منزلی بیرون شد بادنخوت در سرش افتاد

T. S. 104, l. 2.

"When he had marched *one stage* further, the wind of arrogance began to blow in his head".

بیک 'for one' has been misunderstood as the name of a place where he made the first halt.

I. 315, *l*. 9 from foot. *After some time had elapsed, a party of soldiers one morning forced the gate of the city [of Multān].*

Mīr M'aṣūm states that the siege dragged on for about a year and gives the exact date of capture as 11th (or 15th) Rabī'u-s Sānī 933 H. (T. S. 159, l. 4). But the T. A. (Lith. 648, l. 1) puts it at the end of 934 H. and F. in 932! (II. 331, l. 17). This author merely states that Shāh Ḥasan started on the expedition in the beginning of 931 H.

I. 316, *l.* 11. *In the Ramazān A. H. 949..., the Emperor...Humāyūn... came from Lāhore towards Sind.*

949 is a manifest error for 947. تسع must have been wrongly written or read instead of سبع. Note that this author himself speaks, on p. 317, of a subsequent event having happened on 1st Jumādī-l-awwal 948. See also M'aṣūm, T. S. 167, l. 13. The whole account is borrowed from the *Tārīkh-i-Sind* of the older author.

I. 318, *l.* 10 from foot. *One day Tīmūr Sultān [and others] made preparations to attack a fort which was filled with grain.*

Mīr M'aṣūm, from whose account this is abridged, gives the name of the fort as *Batora* بتوره (T. S. 178, l. 19), which may be Mīrpur Batoro now in Karāchī district. Constable, Pl. 26, B. C.

I. 319, *l.* 14 from foot. *He (Shāh Ḥasan or Ḥusain Arghūn) installed Shaibah and Rafīk, two slaves.*

The first name is given as 'Shanba' in Malet, 124 and also in the T. S. 184, l. 11; 187. l. 18; M. F. L. Ms. 115 a, l. 3 ff.

The man may have been so called because he was born on a Saturday. Jum'a and Ādīna (Friday) also are not uncommon personal names among Musalmans. A man called 'Chihār-Shanbah' (Wednesday) is mentioned by Bābur in his *Tūzuk* and he notes the whimsical coincidence that when Muẓaffar Ḥusain Mirzā defeated Muḥammad Mūmin on a Wednesday, the latter was taken captive by this 'Chihār Shanbah.' (Pers. Trans. 29, l. 9 from foot; Mrs. Beveridge, B. N. Tr. 71; Memoirs of Babar, Tr. Erskine, 46).

A soldier named Adīna Bahādur is mentioned in the *Mulfūẓāt-i Tīmurī* (E. D. III. 406), and the name was also borne by a renowned governor of the Punjab in the 18th Century. The custom of naming children after the days of the week on which they are born is prevalent also among the Hindus. The Hijrī months Rabī'a, Rajjab, Sh'abān and Ramaẓān also figure as personal names amongst Musalmans.

I. 321, *l.* 8. *On his arrival within two Kos of the city, the two armies came into collision on the banks of the stream of Shāh Panāh.*

چون بموضع ساپاه [variant سابارة] رسیدند التقاء جیوش
بین الطرفین واقع شد

(T. S. 189, l. 11; M. F. L. Ms. 118 b, l. 1).

"When they reached *the village of Sāpāh*, the armies on both sides confronted each other".

I 321, *l.* 14 from foot. *Ahmad Khwāja flourished three generations before Malik Mahmūd Khān, a man famous for his generosity and nineteen generations after Iddī, son of Hātim Tāi.*

As all the extracts translated here from the *Tarkhān-Nāma* have been lifted by the compiler of that work from Mīr M'aṣūm, it is necessary to point out that the latter puts the matter somewhat differently. It is clear, from what he states, that the person who flourished nineteen generations before Iddī, the son of Hātim Ṭāī was Malik Maḥmūd *Nāndīh* (giver of bread) and not Aḥmad Khwāja. (M. F. L. Ms. 134 a, l. 5; T. S. 218, l. 14). This would mean that there were 19 + 3 + 1 or 23 generations between Aḥmad Khwāja and Hātim Ṭāī. Ḥusain Waiẓ Kāshifī states that Hātim died 945 years before 907 H—the year in which he wrote—*i. e.* about 585 A. C. (Akhlāq-i-Muḥsinī, Ch. XXI) According to another account, Iddī died in 68 A. H. at the age of 120 (Eastwick, Tr. S'adi's Gulistān, p. 116 Note). The name of Mīr Faẓil's father is given by Mīr M'aṣūm as '*Ādil* Khān', not 'Āqil Khān', as on l. 15 (T. S. 218, l. 5).

I. 324, *l.* 17. *In the beginning of the year 964 H. (November, 1556), Mirzā Muhammad Bākī rebelled against his father.*

The year is given as 967 H. by Mīr M'aṣūm (T. S. 208, l. 5; M. F. L. Ms. 127 b, 2 ff). The later compiler must have wrongly read ربع for سبع as the date is given in the primary authority as

سبع و ستین و تسعمایه

I. 331, *l.* 10 from foot. *There are also women who feed on liver and foretell things to come.*

Ibn Baṭṭūṭṭa, Sīdī 'Alī Capudan and Abū-l-Faẓl mention this superstition, but there is an earlier parallel in the *Kathā Sarit Sāgara.* In the story of 'the King and the Barber's wife' (Book VI. Ch. 32), the poor husband on being asked by the adulterer why he had become so emaciated, says, 'King, my wife is a witch. And when I am asleep, she extracts my entrails and sucks them and then replaces them as before. This is how I have become lean". (Tr. Tawney, I. 289, Edit. Penzer III. 102).

I. 350, *l.* 11 from foot. ***Nawāb Murīd Khan...was by birth the son of a Rāja and newly converted to the Muhammadan faith.***

As the anecdote told by this author is not without interest, it may be worth while to identify its hero. According to the *Maāṣiru-l-Umarā*, he was Bhāo Singh. Rāja of Maū and Paithan or Nūrpūr. Rāja Basū of Maū had three sons, Surajmal, Madhusingh and Jagatsingh. The last died in 1055 H., leaving two sons, Rājrup, who reigned upto 1071 H. and Bhāo Singh who turned Muḥammadan in the early years of Aurangzeb's reign. His descendants are said, by this author, to have held in *jagīr* the *pargaṇa* of Shāhpūr *'urf* Bharwīn in Gurdāspūr district, and it was the custom for whosoever became Rāja to assume the name of 'Murīd Khān' (Blochmann's article on the History of the Rājas of Nūrpūr in Ind. Ant. for 1872, p. 264. See also *Maāṣiru-l-Umarā*, II. 281, l. 12).

VOL. II GHAZNAVIDES, GHORIS AND SLAVE KINGS.

II. 17, *l*. 8 from foot. *His [Kirmānī's] notions of the value of History are correct enough, though it must be confessed they are very original.*

The printer has just inverted the author's meaning by leaving out the negative between 'are' and 'very'. Elliot himself, after quoting these 'notions', stigmatises them, justly enough, as "solemn truisms", on the penultimate line of this page.

II. 38, *l*. 6. *He [Sulṭān Maḥmūd] turned Newāsa Shāh out of his government and took possession of all the treasures he had accumulated.*

Gardezī tells us that Sukhpāl or Nabāsa Shāh had fallen into the hands of Abū 'Alī Sīmjūrī and that when the Hindu revolted, and Maḥmūd pursued him, he was captured in the 'hills of Kashtūr' کوهپای کشتور (Z. A. 69. l. 6 from foot). Dr. Nāẓim has hazarded the conjecture that the place meant is 'Khewra' in the Salt Range in the Punjab (*Ibid.* note), but I venture to suggest that a much closer phonetic approach may be found in the old Hindu principality of Kishtwār in Kashmīr. Sukhpal's family connection with Kashmīr lends support to this identification. *Vide* my Note on E. D. II. 42. l. 3 in S. T. M. II. 145. Kishtwār had its own Hindu rulers for hundreds of years and it was overrun and conquered by the Musalmans only in the time of Jahāngīr. It was, however, soon restored to the Rāja, as it was not worth retaining, and a liability rather than an asset.

II. 65, *l*. 12. *Bū Suhal discreetly moved away and I delivered all the messages.*

بوسهل نیک از جای بشد و من پیغام بتمامی بگذاردم

Text, 173. l. 13.

'Bū Suhal was greatly disconcerted and I repeated the whole message'. Six lines lower down on the same page, Dowson again renders the same phrase, 'Bū Suhal had quitted his place', but the real meaning is 'upset, put out, beside himself with shame or anger, annoyed'. Baihāqī uses the idiom very frequently. He tells us, for instance, that when he heard of Ḥaṣīrī's arrest, he was 'confounded', grieved, purturbed من که ابوالفضلم از جای بشدم (Text, 188. l. 3 from foot), because he was under great obligations to Ḥaṣīrī and his son.

Elsewhere again, he writes that when Khwāja Aḥmad Ḥasan reprimanded Abū Suhal for his unmannerly outburst against Ḥasnak, 'he (Abū Suhal) was greatly disconcerted'. وی نیک ازجای بشد (Text, 214. l. 10). Elsewhere the idiom is found in juxtaposition with and as a synonymous locution of خجل شد 'was ashamed, chapfallen'. (Text, 149. l. 8).

چون این سخنان با امیر محمود بگفتند خجل شد و نیک از جای بشد

Lastly we read that Amīr Masūd نیک از جای بشد (150. l. 5), when he heard that his father had a design to arrest him.

Muhammad Alī Khān Ansārī, the author of the *Tārīkh i Muẓaffarī*, writes that when Kām Bakhsh heard of the death of 'Azam Shāh, he was not at all moved or upset.

اخبار کشتہ شدن اعظم شاہ استماع نمودہ از جا نرفتہ

(My Manuscript).

II. 68, *l.* 14. ***The following day which was Sunday, the 9th of the month of Safar, the Khwāja entered the Court.***

The Bibl. Ind. Text also gives 9th (التاسع من صفر 176. l. 2 from foot), but it must be a slip of the pen for رابع *i. e.* the 4th. If the 1st of Muḥarram 422 H. fell, as Baihāqī himself states (E. D. II. 61 = Text, 168. l. 19), on a Tuesday, the 9th of Ṣafar must have been a Friday, and the 4th a Sunday. In fact, Dowson himself makes the 7th a Wednesday, the 11th a Sunday and the 15th a Thursday on pp. 73, 74 and 76 of these Extracts. If these weekdays are correctly given, Sunday ***must*** have fallen on the 4th and not on the 9th of Ṣafar.

II. 74, *l.* 3. ***Bū Suhal who had been removed from the post of Wazīr, was appointed to the duty of controlling the financial affairs of the Kingdom.***

Dr. Nāẓim contends that the post to which Bū Sahl Hamdūnī was now appointed was that of Head of the Secret Intelligence department (M. G. 144). But Dowson appears to me to be right in speaking of it as 'the controllership of the financial affairs of the Kingdom'. He is said to have been given (Text, 183. l. 5) the شغل اشراف مملکت or appointed as the مشرف مملکت. مشرف means overseer, supervisor, inspector, and especially an examiner of accounts or certifier of expenditure. Every department of the State had one or more *Mushrifs* on the staff, and every province also seems to have had its *Mushrif*. For instance, Baihāqī speaks of the شغل اشراف اوقاف غزنی the Accountantship of the religious endowments of Ghaznī (308. l. 6

from foot) and also of the شغل اشراف ناحیت گیری, the Accountantship of the district or territory of Girī. (331. l. 15). Elsewhere, Baihāqī states that in the reign of Farrukhzād, the *Ishrāf-i-Mamlakat* was held by Abū l-Faraj 'Alī *bin* Al Muẓaffar, who was "unique in his age for virtue, wisdom, learning and courtesy"

مردیست در فضل و عقل و علم و ادب یگانهٔ روزگار

(291. l. 10).

These laudatory expressions could hardly be meant for the 'chief spy' and Abū l-Faraj was, most probably, the Sulṭān's Revenue Minister, if not his Grand Wazīr.

There was a *Mushrif* in every one of the *Kārkhānās* of Akbar and his duties are described by Abūl Fazl *Aīn.* Tr. I. (Reprint) 145.

Khwāja Sultan Ali was Mushrif-i Khaāzna of Humayun A. N. Khwāja Manṣūr, who afterwards became Akbar's revenue minister, had been a *Mushrif* in the Perfumery Department (A. N. Text, III. 193; Tr. III. 273; Budāūni, II. 240; Tr. II. 247).

Patardās (or Tipperdās) had at one time been *Mushrif* or accountant of the elephant-stables (T. J. 10. l. 4, Tr. I. 23).

The *Mushrif-i-Mamlakat* appears to have been the Inspector-General of the income of the whole empire, the Revenue Minister or controller of finance. His position was second only to that of the Prime Minister and Hamdūnī was now tactfully placated in this way by Khwāja Aḥmad Ḥasan, as before the latter's arrival, he (Hamdūnī) had been the Chief Wazīr of Sultan Mas'ūd. In later times, we learn from Minhāj that Tājulmulk Maḥmūd was not only دبیر *Dabīr*, (Secretary of State) under Iltutmish, but also the *Mushrif-i-Mamlakat* and it was he who was ordered by that Sulṭān to register "the name of Raẓīyya as heir of the Kingdom and successor to the throne". (T. N. Text, 185. l. 15 = E. D. II. 333). Again, when the Prime Minister Badru-d-dīn Sunqur convened a secret council to confabulate about the deposition of Mu'izzu-d-dīn Bahrām Shāh, the conspirators met in the house of Ṣadrul Mulk Tāju-d-dīn 'Alī Mūsawī, who was the *Mushrif-i-Mamālik*. (Ṭ. N. 193. l. 8; E. D. II. 338). A later historian (Shamsi Sirāj) reports that the veteran statesman 'Ainulmulk Māhrū was appointed *Mushrif-i-mamālik* by Firūz Tughlaq. He then relates that soon after 'Ainulmulk took his seat in the *Diwān-i-Wizār t*, there was a violent altercation between him and the Prime Minist in regard to the rights and privileges of his own office and that of his c adjutor,

the *Mustaufīal mamālik*. As both these dignitaries performed the duties of accountant-general or auditor-general, it had been hitherto the practice for all fief-holders and *Khālaṣā* officials to submit all accounts of income, as well as expenditure summarily, and also in detail, to each of them, as well as to the *Diwān i Wizārat*, i. e. the Prime Minister. ʿAinulmulk objected to the *detailed* accounts of his own, that is, the Revenue (جمع) department being submitted to the *Mustaufīal Mamālik*. He contended that the latter's duties related specially to Expenditure (خرج and not to جمع). The Prime Minister retorted by asking what right he had, in that case, to have detailed accounts of Expenditure submitted to *him*. When the controversy was referred to the Sulṭān, he compromised matters by deciding that the *Mushrif-i-Mamālik* should receive detailed accounts of all Income or Revenue and only summary accounts of Expenditure. The *Mustaufīal Mamālik* was entitled to have detailed accounts of Expenditure but, statements of Revenue only in the form of summaries or abstracts. But he gave orders, that at the same time, detailed as well as summary accounts of *both* Revenue and Expenditure were to be forwarded for registration and sanction to the Prime Minister. This passage throws revealing light on the subject and proves beyond doubt that the *Mushrif i Mamlakat* was the Chief Commissioner of Revenue and the *Mustaufī* Auditor-General of Expenditure.

Then again, we are informed in the *Tārīkh i Mubārakshāhī*, that as the multifarious duties of the *Diwān i Wizārat* were not satisfactorily performed by Sarwaru-l-Mulk alone, the *Diwān i Ishrāf* (*i Mamlakat*) was specially handed over to or placed under the authority of Kamālu-l-Mulk and the Prime Ministership وزارت only was confirmed to Sarwaru-l-Mulk (Text, 232. l. 1 = E. D. IV. 78).

The meaning seems to be that the اشراف or Mushrifship of the entire State revenue was placed under his control and he was appointed *Mushrif i Mamlakat* or Controller of the Revenue branch of the *Dīwāni Wizārat*.

In later times, Muẓaffar Khān Turbatī is said to have been "raised to the post of *Wizārat* and *Diwan i a'alā*" in the 9th year of Akbar's reign. (Ṭ. A. 262. l. 14 = E. D. V. 287). It is also stated that the affairs of the *Dīwānī* were left to him (*Ibid.* 276. l. 11; 278. l. 7 from foot = E. D. V. 313, 319). In the eighteenth year, he was made *Wazīr* of the whole empire and given the title of *Jumlatu-l-mulk* or Administrator General of the Revenue. (*Ibid.* 312. l. 5; E. D. V. 370).

Some years later, we are told that this Muẓaffar Khān, who had been *Mushrif i divān* was appointed Governor of Bengal (341. l. 5 from foot, E. D. V. 410).

Lastly, Niẓāmu-d-dīn speaks of Rājā Todar Mal also as *Mushrif-i-diwān* and *Vakīl* of the Sulṭanate, when recording his death in the annals of the 35th year (Text, 343, l. 10 from foot = E. D. V. 458). In the light of this evidence, it seems safe to say that the *Mushrif i Mamlakat* of the Ghaznavides performed the same duties as the *Mushrif i dīwān* or the *Mushrif i dīwān i a'alā* of the days of Akbar.

He was, in fact "the Chief financial minister charged with the collection of the revenue and the remittance of it to the Imperial treasury." (H. H. Wilson, Glossary, *s. v.* Dewaun).

II. 74, *l.* 9 from foot. ***Bū-l Kāsim Kasīr had himself been minister and Abūl-Hasan was his purchased slave, I will mention hereafter, what happened to each of them.***

Has not Elliot's Munshī put a vile calumny into Baihāqīs mouth?

بوالقاسم کثیرخود وزارت رانده بود وبوالحسن غلام وی خریده
وبیارم پس ازاین که برهر یکی ازاینها چه رفت

Text, 184. l. 1.

Perhaps the real meaning is :

"Būl Qāsim had himself performed the duties of a Wazīr and Bū-l-Ḥasan had purchased one of his (Bū-l-Qāsim's) slaves. I will afterwards tell what happened to each of them (in connection with that purchase)".

II. 76, *l.* 11. *He [Bū-l Kāsim] ... ... besought the servant not to tell the occurrence to his master, lest next day, he should demand an apology.*

والتماس کرد تا ازین حدیث با خداوندش نگوید که وی
عذر این فردا بخواهد

Text, 185, last line.

"Beacause he himself [Bū-l Qāsīm] would beg pardon for the misconduct the next day" [from the Khwāja].

He begged the menial to make no complaint, as he himself intended to make a full apology to the Khwāja on his own, as well as his father's behalf, at the earliest opportunity on the morning of the next day.

II. 78, *l.* 2 from foot. ***He replied, the Khalīfa (governor) has brought Hasīrī and his son to the Khwāja's house and has set them up there and chastised them.***

گفت بوبکر حصیری را و پسرش را خلیفه بخانهٔ خواجه
آورده اند و بایستاده انیده اند و عقابین بزدند

188. l. 8 from foot.

It is fairly clear from the context that they had not been 'chastised' or beaten yet, and in fact, they did not 'eat the stick' at all. The word عقابین has several meanings. It is used for 'the two tall posts of wood to which criminals who are to be punished are tied',

دو چوب باشد که مجرمانرا بدان بندند

and also for 'spiked iron rods which are used as whips' خارهای آهنین (*Ghīyāṣul-lughāt, s. v.*). Here it is used for the posts and not the whips. Baihāqī uses the word in *both these senses*, though Dowson has not distinguished between them. When he says هر یک را هزار عقابین بزدند (Text 189. l. 2 and 190 l. 3 from foot), he has in mind the cat-o-nine tails of the Ghaznivides, but when he writes that the Khwāja turned to Bū'Abdulla Pārsī and asked him if بر عقابین نکشیدند ایشانرا (192. l. 3 from foot) and when he orders Bū 'Abdulla to say

بگوی تا هر دو را بر عقابین کشند

(193. l. 2) the reference is to the posts. He asked him if they had not been bound to (lit. stretched upon) the posts or ordered them to be so bound preparatory to the chastisement. Dowson's rendering 'beaten' or 'inflicted punishment' (82, last line; 83. l. 6) is a loose paraphrase, as عقابین is meant for the 'whipping-post'.

"Elsewhere also, Baihāqī uses the word for the posts when he speaks of Khwāja Aḥmad Ḥasan's intention to order Bū-l-Qāsim Kaṣīr to be stretched or bound to the posts and given a beating".

تا بر عقابینش کشند و می زنند

(448, l. 13).

The *Muiyyad al Fuzlā* explains that they were so called on account of hooks like the talons of eagles (عقابین) which were attached to them. A similar contraption was known as 'the triangle' because it was "a frame of three poles or halberds stuck in the ground to which soldiers were bound to be flogged". It was formerly in use in the British Army.

II. 83, *l.* 18. ***The story of Māmūn and Ibrāhīm is well known to you.***

This story is in ʿAwfī's *Jawāmiʿaul Ḥikāyāt* (Niẓāmud-dīn, Introduction, p. 208, Story No. 3, 1476). Ibrāhīm was the son of Mahdī and the brother of Harūnar Rashīd. Māmūn was the son of Harūn and during his absence in Khurāsān on a military expedition, there was a revolt at Baghdād. Ibrāhīm was proclaimed *Khalīf* and his usurpation lasted for about two years. When Māmūm returned, Ibrāhīm had to seek safety in flight and after a series of adventures, which are related at length by Ṭabarī, he surrendered to his nephew and confessed his fault. Māmūn forgave him. (Suyūtī, *Tārikh-i- Khulafā*, Tr. Jarrett, 309 note).

II. 83, *l.* 19. ***It is foolish of me to speak of such a thing to you. It is carrying dates to Basra.***

Ibn Baṭṭūṭā writes that there was "an exactly similar saying about Hajar, also called Lahsa or Al Hasa, because dates are so abundant there that the inhabitants feed their beasts of burden on them (Defrémery, II. 248). Nāṣir Khusraw makes the same remark about the place. (*Ṣafarnāma* Ed. Sir R., Wilson, The Persian Gulf, 91). Idrīsī states in his article on Baṣra that in the year 536 H. (1141 A. C.), five hundred *roṭls* of dates sold for a single *dīnār*. (Tr. Jaubert, I. 368). Friar Odoric of Pardenone (*c.* 1321 A. C.) tells us of the people residing in these parts that "they live almost entirely on dates and you get forty-two pounds of dates for less than a groat" (Yule, Cathay, Ed. Cordier, II. 111–112).

II. 87, *l.* 4. ***[Ḥaṣīrī] made his apologies. It was a good thing that he was old.***

وی عذرها خواست و نیکو سخن پیری بود

197. l. 14.

Rather, 'he was an old man of fair words, (an old man of sweet speech or with a very polite or civil tongue in his head.)' They were both advanced in years and there is no point in the statement as it stands in the translation. What is really meant is that both vied with each other in making apologies for what had occurred—Ḥaṣīrī for the stupid rudeness of his servants and Maimandī for the vindictive measures of retaliation which he had contemplated.

II. 88, *l.* 7. ***I have now arrived at the age of sixty-five, and I must act as becomes my years.***

چه عمر بشصت وپنج آمده و براثر وی من بباید رفت

207. l. 5 from foot.

"As my age has now arrived at sixty-five years and I shall have soon to follow him [Abū Sahl Zauzānī to the grave]".

He means that he himself would have soon to render an account to God. Elsewhere also, in speaking of Abū Sahl, Baihaqī writes that those who had been intriguing against him have departed. (Text, p. 26, (l. 5 و ما را نیز بباید رفت کہ روز عمر بشبانگاہ آمدہ است and 'I also shall have to go, as the day of my life is nearing its evening'.

II. 91, *l.* 16. ***When the Sultān [Maḥmūd] departed this life, what great efforts he made in behalf of my brother. Still he did not go to him.***

چون پدرم گذشتہ شد چہ جہد ھا کرد بزرگ در روزگار برادرم و لیکن نہ برفتش

210. l. 12.

"When my father passed away, what great efforts did he make in the days (*i. e.* reign) of my brother, though it did not succeed". نرفتش is used here very much in the sense of the English phrase 'it was no go'; it was not to be done, it would not do, he could make no progress with his plans.

Blochmann notes that رفتن is often used in 'Turānīan Persian' in the sense of شدن *e. g.* قربانت روم 'I am thy sacrifice'. (Contributions to Persian Lexicography), J. A. S. B. XXXVII. 35. Baihaqī uses, نرفت in this sense at 100 l. 4. On p. 150. l. 10, Baihaqī uses the expression. آن کار پیش نرود

II. 93, *l.* 8 from foot. ***Notwithstanding this, the suspicion and bigotry of the Khālif increased more and more, but secretly, not openly, until at length, Amīr Mahmūd received the Farmān.***

I have pointed out in the note on this passage in S. I. M. H. 157, that فرمان یافت is really a periphrastic equivalent of 'died'. As the idiom is archaic or obsolescent, and the context is not such as to elucidate the meaning, it may be permissible to cite a passage in which it is used and at the same time explained by the Emperor Jahāngīr.

In recording the sudden death of Yūsuf Khān, son of the better known, Ḥusain Khān Tukrīya, he states that he was taken ill when paying his respects to Prince Khurram. He fainted and fell down. "His servants took him home and as he arrived, the messenger of death came also. He *received his command* and left his heavy lump of earth in this perishable dustbin". **(T. J. R and B's Trans. II. 202; Text, 329, l. 10 from foot).**

نوکرانش × × بخانہ رسانیدند و بمجرد رسیدن پیک اجل در رسید و
فرمان یافت و این خاک تودہ گران بار را بخاکدان فانی گذاشت

Compare also the following lines from an old English hymn :

My life's brief remnant all be Thine,
And when Thy sure decree
Bids me this fleeting breath resign,
O, speed my soul to Thee !

Roundell Palmer. The Book of Praise, No. CCXXIV.

II. 93, *l.* 2 from foot. ***On Tuesday, the 7th of Safar, when the Court broke up.***

The date is wrongly given. It should be 27th, as in the B. I. Text, 213. l. 6.

An event which took place on Thursday, the 15th of Ṣafar has been already recorded on p. 76 of these Extracts, and if the 15th was a Thursday, the 27th *must* have fallen on a Tuesday. Dowson himself speaks of "the next morning, Wednesday, two days before the last day of Ṣafar", *i. e.*, the 28th of Ṣafar, on p. 97. l. 14.

II. 96 last line. ***And I learnt from 'Amīd' Abdu-r-Razzāk.***

'Amīd' means a chief, or great man, but was at this time prefixed to the names of the greatest and most distinguished statesmen, and politicians, who had been all-powerful or commanded universal respect.

Ustād (استاد) was used in much the same way. (Sachau's note, Trans. Alberūnī's India. II. 250).

II. 105, *l.* 3. ***The Khwāja replied, 'Now I cannot say anything'.***

اکنون بندہ سخن بتواند گفت

Text, 266. l. 8.

Elliot's MS appears to have read نتواند گفت. But the context shows that بتواند is the right reading. The Khwāja had, at first, hesitated to give his opinion for fear of incurring the Sulṭān's displeasure. Then the Sulṭān had appealed to his sense of duty and adjured him as the most trusted of his servants and his deputy or *Khalīfa* to give him his "advice according to his own knowledge" and even promised to "listen to it" and give "orders only after pondering over it". The Khwāja, therefore, speaks out and exponuds the other side of the case, with a view to dissuade his master from the unwise course of arresting Arīyāruq. In fact, he delivers a speech which fills nearly a page. The negative must be, therefore, wrong and out of place in the context.

II. 111, *l.* 15. ***Amīr 'Abdūs was sent to Arīyāruk's party.***

امیر عبدوس را نزدیک قوم اریارق فرستاد

Text, 273. l. 12.

"The Amīr (i.e. Sulṭān Mas'ūd) sent 'Abdūs to the followers of Arīyāruq etc.". Baihaqī never prefixes the title of Amīr to the name of 'Abdūs or that of any other official. He reserves it for the Sulṭān himself and his sons. Maudūd, Majdūd, Yazdīar and S'aīd are occasionally styled 'Amīr; Mas'ūd's dethroned and blinded brother has also this handle to his name, but that is because he belonged to the royal family and had even occupied the throne.

II. 112, *l.* 2. ***He [Arīyāruq] was captured in Balhh, on Wednesday, the 19th of Rabī'u-l-awwal, 422 H.***

Baihāqī has just said that the 27th of Ṣafar, (not 7th as in Dowson, p. 93) was a Tuesday and the 28th a Wednesday. If the 19th of Rabī' I also was a Wednesday, thirty days and not twenty-nine only, must have been allotted to Ṣafar. To give another instance of a similar breach of the bookrule. On p. 114, we are told that the 9th of Rajab—the day of the great flood in Ghaznī—was a Saturday and on p. 118. l. 7 from foot, it is stated that the 2nd of Sh'abān was a Sunday. But this would be in serial order only if twenty-nine days, and not thirty, were reckoned to Rajab. Then, we are told (p. 139. l. 16) that the first of Muḥarram 429 H. was a Saturday and the 6th a Thursday and a few lines lower down, (p. 140. l. 7), the 14th of Ṣafar is recorded as a Saturday. But this would be in proper sequence only if only twenty-nine days and not thirty had fallen to the share of Muḥarram in that year. It would be easy to multiply instances almost indefinitely, from the eight hundred and odd pages of Baihāqī's *Tārīkh.* These examples must suffice to prove that his chronology takes no account of the book-rule. It is founded, not on the facile alternation of 30 and 29 days prescribed by it, but on the actual visibility رویت of the new moon. He seems to have ignored the unorthodox rule-of-thumb devised by the mathematicians.

II. 112, *l.* 4. ***On the day after his arrest, the Amīr sent to his house...... Bū S'aīd Mushrif..... who had not then attained the rank of Mushrif, but was one of the grandees of the Court and was known by the name of Kāzī Khusru Hasan.***

بوسعید مشرف را کہ × × × هنوز مشرفی نداده بودند

کہ اشراف درگاه باسم قاضی حسن (خسرو حسن (variant) بود

274. l. 11.

"To Bū S'aīd *Mushrif*...His Majesty had not yet given the office of *Mushrif*. The *Ishrāf* (that is, office of *Mushrif*) of the Sulṭān's Court stood then in the name of [that is, was filled or occupied by] Qāẓī Ḥasan [or Khusrav Ḥasan]". The statement about Bū S'aīd is only a parenthetical remark.

The word 'Mushrif' is wrongly rendered as 'commandant of a detachment' on l. 9. It really signifies 'paymaster, certifier, examiner or auditor of expenditure'. The word is derived from وفا 'satisfaction, fulfilment' and the *Mustaufī* is 'he who certifies to the payment of the whole of what is due" (Richardson). Shams-i-Sirāj states explicitly that it was the business of the *Mustaufī-al-mamālik* to "scrutinise the expenditure incurred by the State for the good of the subjects of the empire".

تا در خرچهاي مملکت کہ در حق خلائق سلطنت مي شود احتیاط کند

(T. F. 458. l. 4 from foot; see also *Ibid*. 409. l. 7).

II. 112, *l.* 15. ***His best slaves were made captives, those of the second rank were given to Ghāzī the commander, and the King's attendants.***

The reason for penalising the very best of the slaves is not stated and there can be little doubt that the author's meaning has been misunderstood.

آنچہ غلامانش بودند خیاره در وثاقها کردند

274. l. 4 from foot.

"And the choicest of his slaves were sent to the slaves' quarters (or barracks within the precincts of the Palace). The best were appropriated by the Sulṭān himself, those of the second class were given away to Ghāzī and other chamberlains. On p. 284. l. 8 from foot, Baihāqī recurs to the subject and states.

هرچہ خیاره‌تر بود بوثاق فرستاد و آنچہ نبایست بحاجبان و سرالیان بخشید

"He [the Sulṭān] sent the best to the Palace-quarters and gave away those that he did not himself require to the chamberlains and other attendants". See also *Ibid*. 283. ll. 10-13. The غلامان وثاق were, in fact, the same as the غلامان سرای *i. e.* the slaves of the Palace or the Sulṭān's personal slaves. See 652. l. 4 from foot, 149. ll. 11–14 and 351. l. 4.

وثاق means residence, dwelling. Minhāj uses in that sense and Baihāqī also. The Sulṭān's personal slaves غلامان سرای were quartered in houses or 'barracks' near the Imperial residence. These new

acquisitions were not sent to prisons but to these 'barracks'. These غلامان سرای or غلامان وثاق were really like the 'Chelās' of the Mughal Emperors, who are described by Mr. Irvine as "slave-soldiers of the Royal Household" (Tr. Storia, IV. 512).

II. 114, *l*. 10. ***They [the herdsmen] removed towards the wall near the suburb of the ironmongers.***

و خویشتن را بپای آن دیوارها افگندند که بمحلت دیه آهنگران پیوسته است

Text, 316. l. 1.

'Āhangarān' seems to me to be used here as a proper name. It was the specific designation of the village itself and had no connection with the artisans or craftsmen mentioned. A fortified town called Āhangarān in Ghor is mentioned by Minhāj (T. N. 40. l. 12, E. D. II. 285). Baihāqī himself states elsewhere that the palace of the *Khwājai-buzurg*, Abūl'Abbās Isfarāinī, who had been the Prime Minister of Sulṭān Maḥmūd, was situated in the 'village of Āhangarān' دیه آهنگران (625, l. 7). It is not likely that the great Khwāja should have built a mansion for himself in the detectable vicinity of the blackened hovels and smoking furnaces of these artisans. There was a village of this name on the Hari Rūd in Khurasan B. N. 308 n. There is a dale of this name south-east of Tashkint also. The name is written *Angren* on the maps. B. N. 90, 192 and notes, and 161.

II. 117, *l*. 22. ***Your demeanour must not be such as to aggrieve me and I must not take such proceedings as to irritate you.***

But what Baihāqī really says is this :

ونباید که ترا صورت باشد که از تو آزاری دارم و یا قصدی بد کنم تا دل بدنداری

Text, 325. l. 6.

"And it is not proper for you to imagine that I bear you any grudge [or malice] or that I am trying to injure you. Take care not to entertain any ill will to me".

The Khwāja had initiated inquisitorial proceedings against him and got the exchequer officials to demand the reimbursement of large sums of money. He was now trying to assure Aḥmad that this had been done, not for personal reasons, or because he bore any dislike to him or wished to pay off old scores. The investigations relating to former financial transactions had been instituted by him only under a sense of duty, only because he "was bound by oath to do his utmost in the King's business".

II. 119, *l.* 18. ***Abū-l-Fath and Dāmghānī were sent with Abū-l-Faraj Kirmānī.***

Delete 'and'. It is not in the B. I. Text, 327. l. 6. Dāmghānī was Abū-l-Fatḥ's *nisba*. Another official named Abū-l-Qāsim Dāmghānī is mentioned by Baihāqī, Text, 404. l. 13.

II. 125, *l.* 5 from foot. ***We will send a general to Sind, it may be.***

There is no reference to Sind here.

Text 501. l. 6. سالاري فرستيم بسنده باشد

"We will send one (of the other) commanders. That will be sufficient".

بسنده is frequently used by Baihāqī in this sense. *e. g.*

پس گفتم من درين ميانه چه كارم بوسهل بسنده است

(Text 172. l. 11) which Dowson himself renders.

II. 126, *l.* 1 from foot. ***What I have sought for in this matter, I will accomplish. I will draw up a plan for the approval of His Majesty.***

اكنون آنچه درخواستم است درين باب درخواهم و نسختی كنم

Text, 502. l. 10.

"Now, whatever is required for this purpose [in the way of troops, equipment etc.]. I will apply for and put it all down in writing"

So, Baihāqī says that when Bū Sahl Ḥamdūnī was appointed governor of Rai he said :

[بنده] مواضع بنويسد و آنچه درخواستنی است درخواهد

482. l. 6.

II 129, *l.* 7 from foot. ***In the middle of this month (Ramaẓān H. 425; July 1033), letters were received from Lāhore, etc.***

Dowson has given the Christian year wrongly. Ramaẓan 425 H. began on 20th July 1034. On p. 132, he himself states, inconsistently, but correctly, that Ẓī-l-q'ad 425 corresponded with September 1034.

II. 130, *l.* 12. ***It was reported that Tilak Hindū had collected a powerful army and was advancing in that direction that the heart of that vile rebel [Aḥmad Niāltigīn] was quaking within him and that there was a space of only two Kos between the two armies.***

و دو گروهی درميان لشكر او افتاد

Text, 524. l. 11.

"And there happened to be [lit. fell] two parties [groups or factions] in his army".

The real meaning is that there were dissensions among his followers and some were disposed to go over to Tilak. The word is clearly written گروه with the additional stroke and means body, group.

Baihāqī uses a similar expression again on p. 742, l. 8 ff.

چون دیدکم × × × دوگروهی میان برادران و خویشاوندان والعاقل
سهم دستوری خواست تا اینجا آید

and also on p. 866, l. 4 ff.

میان ایشان دوگروهی افگندند

II. 139, *l.* 12. *At last, on Thursday, when eight days of Zīl-hijja remained, the Amīr......departed from Ghaznī.. ...to prosecute his holy war against Hānsī. He remained ten days at Kābul. The first day of Muharram A. H. 429 (14 Oct. 1037) fell on a Saturday.*

Mīrkhwānd, Khwāndmīr, Niẓāmu-d-dīn, Firishta and all others who follow the *Zainal Akhbār*, put this notable event into 427 H., two years before the date given here. They all quote Baihāqī's *Mujalladāt* in their lists of authorities consulted, but do not follow him, and there is little or nothing to indicate that they had read it. If Baihāqī's meticulous and almost day-to-day journal is at all correct, there is no room in his chronicle of H. 427 for any such distant expedition.

II. 141, *l.* 6. *The Turkomāns had come down and plundered Tālikān and Fārīyāb.*

There are at least three places called Ṭāliqān. This is Ṭāliqān or Ṭāiqān in Tukhāristān, about twenty miles north of Mervar-rūd or Mervai-Kūchak or Marūchak. Mas'ūd was afterwards defeated by the Seljūqs near *this* Ṭāliqān. There is another Ṭāliqān, about forty miles south-east of Qunduz in Badakhshān. Constable 22 C b. There is a Ṭāliqān also in Khurāsān.

There are also several places called Fārīyāb. Fārāb or Fārīyāb is the old name of Otrār on the Sīr or Jaxartes. But there is a Fāryāb on the Āmū or Oxus also, to the south-west of Bukhārā. There is a third Fāryāb—'a small locality' in the environs of Balkh and about 22 *farsangs* or 88 miles distant from it. There is a Fāryāb half way between Balkh and Marvar-rūd which is shown in Ferrier's Map (*Tārīkh-i-Rashīdī*, Tr. p. 44 note) and this last is most probably the place referred to here.

II. 141, *l.* 15. ***On Tuesday, the 3rd of Jumâda-l-awwal, the Amîr celebrated the festival of New Year's Day.***

The Hijrī date is given in the Text (666. l. 4) as

روز سه شنبه چهار روز باقی مانده از جماد الاولی

"Tuesday, when four days remained of Jumādī the first, that is, the 27th, and not the 3rd, day of that month. The initial day of the Yazdajardī year 407, according to the old (قدیم) reckoning, began on 7th March 1038 (Cowasji Patell's Chronology, p. 141), which corresponded with 27th Jumādi I, 429 H., according to Gladwin's Tables.

II. 142, *l.* 6 from foot. ***Further news was received that he [Dāūd the Seljūq] had reached Fārīyāb and from that had been summoned to Sabūrkān.***

بپاریاب آمد و از آنجا بسبورقان خواهد بتعجیل

Text, 708. l. 12.

"He had come to Pārīyāb and would very speedily [or quickly, hurriedly, expeditiously] arrive at Sabūrqān".

Shabūrqān is about ninety miles west of Balkh (Yule, Tr. Marco Polo, I. 149). This Fārīyāb may be the place of that name between Balkh and Marūchak or Marvarrūd.

II. 143, *l.* 2 from foot. ***It is said that a service subject to the fluctuations of rising and falling will probably be permanent, but that which smoothly jogs on is liable to incur the whims or rancour of one's master.***

I have pointed out in S. I. M. H. 166, that the whole paragraph has been grossly misunderstood. Baihāqī is moralising on the sudden elevation to high office of an inexperienced youth, named Manṣūr, on account of his relationship to the Prime Minister and of the subsequent disgrace and imprisonment.

What he says is

گفته اند که دولت افتان و خیزان باید که پایدار باشد و دولتی که
هموار می رود بر مراد وبی هیچ کراهیت بیک بار خداوندش بیفتد

Text, 823. l. 14.

"They have said that if good fortune is to be lasting, it should be interrupted. [Lit. falling and rising or marked by vicissitudes]. The man whose prosperity goes on progressing uniformly and just according to his desires, without a hitch, must fall".

Minhāj quotes from some poet a couplet in which the same idea is expressed more neatly and epigrammatically. (Ṭ. N. 264. l. 5).

دولت آن به کم آفت و خیز بود - دولت تیز رستخیز بود

"That fortune is good which rises and falls. Sudden good luck is like the Day of Resurrection".

II. 150, *l.* 20. *To the officers also, I wrote in cypher such and such things, and I said, We are all here of the very same opinion.*

با محتشمان حضرت بگفتم پوشیده که بوزیر نامه فرمود چنین و چنین نبشتم و معما از خویشتن چنین و چنین نبشتم گفتند سخت نیکو اتفاقی افتاده است

Text. 829. l. 9 from foot.

"To the great dignitaries who were present in His Majesty's Court, I said in secret, that he [the Sulṭān] had ordered a letter to be sent to the Wazīr and that I had written thus and thus [as above stated]. (I also informed them) that I had written to him [the Wazīr] in cypher a letter from myself, saying so and so [*i. e.* purporting as above stated]. They said: 'It came about very opportunely'.

What they meant was that if the Sulṭān had not given orders for informing the Wazīr directly of his intentions, I should have had no chance of writing to him secretly and confidentially. It was a happy coincidence, because the private letter could be sent only with the courier, who took the Sulṭān's own missive. It seems indeed to have been surreptitiously enclosed with or inserted in the *Kharīṭa* or post-bag.

II. 151, *l.* 10. *My lord has already seen the result of his excessive obstinacy and this opinion of his obstinate disposition is entertained by all.*

و خداوند تا این غایت چندان استبداد کرد و عاقبت آن دید و این رای و استبداد کردن بر همه بگذشت

830. l. 9.

The latter part of the sentence may be more correctly rendered thus; "But his opinionativeness and obduracy on this occasion have been greater than on any other in the past, *i. e.*, it has surpassed all or broken all former records".

Baihāqī remarks, in another place, that Mas'ūd differed from his father Maḥmūd in this that the latter, though often arbitrary and wrong-

headed, was amenable to reason and persuasion. (Text, 495. l. 5). Elsewhere also, Baihāqī represents Mas'ūd's ministers as complaing that

این خداوند را استبدادی است از خداوند از همه گذشتم

(663. l. 5).

"His Majesty's stubbornness has gone beyond all bounds or gone beyond, (exceeded or surpassed) every one else's".

II. 162, *l.* 2 from foot. ***Muhammad 'Ūfī, the compiler of this work had once been in Kambāyat (Cambay).***

I have, in the note on this passage (S. I. M. H. 171) cited the authority of Buzurg ibn Shahriār's *Kitāb i 'Ajāib-al-Hind* to show that 'Ūfī was only what was called a *beḥermān* in those times. As this word is not found in many dictionaries, it may be worth-while to point out that Ẓīāud-dīn Baranī speaks of Sulṭān Balban holding in great respect the 'Qāẓīs of the army who were then styled 'Beḥermān".

وقاضیان لشکر را کہ ایشانرا بحرمان گفتندی × × حرمت بسیار داشتی

(T. F. 47. l. 7).

The deliberate interjection of this explanation indicates that the word had become obsolescent when Baranī wrote.

II. 163, *l.* 3. ***In this city......was a body of Fire-worshippers as well as the congregation of Musalmans.***

II. 184, *l.* 9. ***Kubād......took as his wife the daughter of a villager from whom was born Naushīrwān.***

This incident is mentioned at length in Firdausī's *Shāhnāma*, Tr. Warner, VII. 197–200; Ibnu-l-Balkhī's *Fārsnāma*, Ed. Le Strange and Nicholson, (Gibb Memorial Series), p. 85, l. 5. Bahrām Gaur's ignoble loves with rustic beauties of humble birth with whom he forgathered by chance in his mad pursuit of the chase are the themes of many a popular saga. He is said to have married all the four daughters of a village-miller (Shāhnāma, Tr. Warner, VII. 31–4), all the three daughters of a *dehkān* or peasant-proprietor, named Barzīn (*Ibid.* VII. 48–54) and also of a jeweller named Māhiyār, (*Ibid.* VII. 55–67), but I cannot find an explicit reference to the Washerman's daughter.

II. 196, *l.* 14. ***He showed favour to Abū Suhail Rāzihi and they conspired against the great Khwāja 'Abdu-r-Razzāk.***

I have ventured to suggest in the note on this passage in S. I. M. H. 178, that رانقی or راضی (as it is written in the *Zīnatal Majālis*)

is an error for رافضی. Abū Sahl Zauzani appears to have been fairly proficient in the 'gentle art of making enemies' and it appears from a passage in Baihāqī that he was openly accused of being a heretic or sectarian (رافضی) and holding unorthodox opinion. We are told, in one of his digressions, that when Abū Sahl was the prime favourite and confidential factotum of the Prince Mas'ūd in Maḥmūd's reign, some of the courtiers formed a conspiracy to ruin him and his envious adversaries got documents prepared and signed by persons of credit throwing doubts upon his orthodoxy.

و محضرها ساختند و در اعتقاد وی سخن گفتند

Maḥmūd who was a relentless persecutor of Shi'as and schismatics summoned him to Ghaznī and threw him into prison. Baihāqī good-naturedly declares that he himself had nothing but good to say about Abū Sahl's religious beliefs and opinions.

و من در اعتقاد این مرد سخن جز نیکوی نگویم

He even goes further and avers that during the thirteen years in which he had come into close contact with Abū Sahl, he had not heard at any time a single word furnishing any grounds or arguments for suspicion in regard to the soundness of his creed.

سخن نشنودم و چیزی نگفت که از آن دلیلی توانستی کرد بر بدی اعتقاد وی

(Text, 25-26).

But Baihāqī's exoneration notwithstanding, it is clear that the canard or calumny had not died out and we may see in this perverted form *Rāẓiqī* [راضقی] a proof of its survival. راضقی is merely a تعریف a blunder due to the diacritical marks or *nuqṭas* of رافضی having been misplaced.

II. 199, *l.* 17. ***Sultān Sanjar...... marched to Ghaznīn against Malik Arslān, and defeated him there on Wednesday, the fourteenth of Shawwāl, A. H. 511.***

The week-day does not work out correctly. The Julian correspondence was Friday, 8th February, 1118 according to the Bookrule (Ind. Ephem). The explanation is probably to be found in the fact that under the *Rūyyat* or *Hilālī* system, four consecutive months are of 30 days, and three successive ones have 29, as Abū-l-Faẓl says (*Āīn.* Tr. Jarrett, II. 27).

II. 203, *l.* 5. ***A description of the Rukh.***

This is not the 'Roc' of the Arabian Nights, but the Dragon of mediaval European romance.

II. 228, *l.* 3. *Rãi Solankh Pãl who had raised the standard of infidelity and perdition......sued for pardon and placed the ring of servitude in his ear.*

May I suggest that this name should be read as *Salkhan* Pāl *i. e.* Sallakshan Pāl, and that he was one of the seven Parīhār Rājās of Gwālior. Their ancestor is said to have wrested the strong-hold from the Kachhwas in 1129 A. C. One of the oldest gates of Gwālior fort is still known as the 'Lakkhan' or 'Lakshaman' Gate. (Luard, Central India Gazetteer, (Gwalior) Vol. I. Pt. I. pp. 224–5) and it may have been called after this ruler. Unfortunately no authentic dynastic list of these chiefs has been yet discovered.

II. 236, *l.* 10. *And his spirit [Muizzud-dīn Sām's] flew above the eight paradises and the battlements of the nine heavens, and joined those of the ten evangelists.*

These so called 'evangelists' are the عشرهٔ مبشره the ten companions of the Arabian Prophet who are said to have been assured by him of seats in Paradise. It is hardly correct to describe them as 'evangelists', as that word means 'a messenger' or 'bringer of good tidings'. These persons did not bring any good news themselves. It was, on the contrary, brought to them. They were only the recipients, not the carriers or messengers, of good tidings.

II. 288, *l.* 10. *Badru-d-dīn Saukartigīn.*

Correctly, Saṉqartigīn or Suṉquartigīn.

Minhaj mentions two Maliks named Badru-d-dīn Sunquri Rūmī and Badru-d-dīn Sūfi i Rūmī (Ṯ. N. 254. l. 9 and 273. l. 11; Raverty, Tr. 752, 787). The 'Idgāh in Palwal contains an inscription in which the building is said to have been erected by Abū-l-Makārim Sunqurtigīn Sunqur in Jumādī I 608 H. (Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica for 1911–12, p. 3). Palwal lies about forty miles south of Dehlī. (Thornton). The name Āqsunqur also occurs (Ṯ. N. 287. l. 5 from foot = E. D. II. 363). سنقر means hawk and آق white in Turkī.

II. 245, *l.* 2 from foot. *He (Iltutmish) returned to Dehli (from Sind) on the 14th of Rabīu-l-awwal 624 H.*

Minhaj who was in the Sultān's retinue states that he returned in Ramazān 625 (Ṯ. N. Text 174. l. 4; E. D. II. 326).

The whole paragraph has been translated by Elliot from a copy of the *Tāju-l-Maāsir* in which the history is carried down to 626 H.—twelve years later than in any other known exemplar. (E. D. II. p. 210).

But this "additional matter" is as Sir Henry admits "characterised" by a "general meagreness of historical details" (*Ibid.*) and this supplement has the appearance of being a rhetorical *tour de force*, a laboured imitation by some learned amanuensis of the florid and verbose style of the original author. The Mulla Firūz Library in Bombay possesses a very old copy which has been wrongly described as تاریخ کامل تام in Rehatsek's Catalogue (VII. 16. p. 131).

It stops at the 'Flight of Nāṣiru-d-dīn and the conquest of Lāhore' (E. D. II. 240) and eschews the so-called 'additional matter'.

Major W. N. Lees assures us that Ḥasan Niẓāmī died very shortly before the arrival of Minhāju-s-Sirāj at Uchh in 624 H. (Art. on Materials for the History of India in J. R. A. S. 1868, p. 438). Unfortunately, he has not cited his authority, for the statement. If it can be substantiated, this supposed continuation must be a fake, as the history is brought down in it to 626 H.—the year of the arrival of the Khalīf of Baghdād's diploma and *Khil'at*.

II. 250, *l.* 2. ***In the year 425 (1034 A. D.) Mas'ūd, son of Mahmūd returned to Hind to destroy the Turks (al Ghuzz).***

He returned *from Hind* to Ghazna.

فی سنہ خمس و عشرین عاد مسعود بن محمود من الهند لقتال الغز

Kāmilat Tawārīkh, Bulāq Edit. IX. 152. l. 9 from foot.

The siege and capture of the fortress of Sarsūti in the earlier part of the year is mentioned by Ibn-al-Athīr on IX. 150. ll. 1–11.

II. 262, *l.* 16. ***History of the Ghaznivides from Subuktigīn to the death of Khusru Malik in A. H. 598 (A. D. 1201).***

Read *588* H. See my Note on E. D. II. 281. l. 6 from foot in S. I. M. H. p. 199. The Christian year should be 1192.

II. 263, *l.* 12 from foot. ***Husāmu-dīn Ghiyāsu-d-dīn......was defeated and slain......in A. H. 634 (A. D. 1226).***

The Hijri year is wrong. It should be 624. The corresponding Christian year is, within limits, correct, as A. H. 624 began on 22nd December 1226.

II. 269, *l.* 6 from foot. ***On the same night that he was born, an idol-temple in India (بہاند recte, 'at Bahind, i e. Wahind), in the vicinity of Parshāwar, on the banks of the Sind, fell down. Minhāj states in the immediately following sentence that the horoscope of figure of the nativity of Maḥmūd was exactly like that of the Founder of Islam.***

Minhāj states in the immediately following sentence that the horoscope or figure of the nativity of Maḥmūd was exactly like that of the Founder of Islam.

و طالع اوبا طالع صاحب ملت اسلام موافق بود

(Text, p. 9. l. 11).

According to his biographers, three prodigies or portents were associated with the event of Muḥammad's birth, *viz.* the fall of twelve towers or battlements of the palace of the Kisrā Anūshīrwān, the entire desiccation of the Sea of Sāwa and the spontaneous extinction of the fires in all the fire-temples of the Persian Empire". (Balkhī, ***Fārsnāma***, 96, l. 3 from foot).

This tale of the occurrence of a similar event in India, the falling-down of the idoltemple in Waihind must have been suggested by this third 'miracle' (کرامت). Then came the corollary or the supposition that the configuration of the planets at the births of both these individuals was identical.

Reverty's rendering is that "the same predominant star was in the ascendant at his birth as appeared at the birth of Islam" (Ṭ. N. Tr. 78–9), but this misses the word صاحب and also the point of the allusion. طالع here means not only the star or planet rising in the east at the time of a person's birth, but the entire diagram or configuration of the heavens at the time, 'the figure of the nativity', as astrologers call it.

Dowson is wrong in giving the Julian equivalent of the date of Maḥmūd's birth, 10th Muḥarram 361 H., as 2nd October 971. It should be 2nd ***November***, 971.

II. 271, *l.* 2 from foot. ***For marks of intelligence and courage were apparent in the brow of Mas'ūd.***

Insert 'more' between 'were' and 'apparent'.

چون آثار سلطنت و شهامت بر ناصیهٔ مسعود زیادت بود

Text, 13. l. 14.

For 'Maujūd' Footnote 2. l. 2 read 'Majdūd. The Bibl. Ind. Text of the Ṭ. N. p. 13 footnote is responsible for the error.

II. 272, *l.* 6. ***The informers told the Sultān Mahmūd of my devotion to Mas'ūd.***

The word is متابعت. It is used here in its ***original*** sense of 'going after' or 'following'. Minhāj employs in the very next line the syno-

nymous expression در عقب مسعود چرا رفتی 'Why did you *go after* Mas'ūd?' A few lines lower down, (Text l. 13), the word used is مشایعت which means 'following others' (Richardson). Dowson renders it 'this little attention of mine' (l. 20), but this is a loose paraphrase. متابعت is used here in its literal sense.

II. 275, *l.* 9 from foot. ***A Turk, by name, Noshtigīn, who was a soldier, turned against Tughril.***

ترکی بود نوشتگین نام سلاح دار بود پس پشت طغرل ایستاده بود

Ṭ. N. 18. l. 3.

'There was a Turk named Nūshtigīn, who was his armour-bearer and used to stand behind the back of Ṭughril'.

II. 277, *l.* 9. ***He bestowed no favours on any one and hence apprehensions about his rule took possession of the hearts of the people.***

بهیچ کس التفات نکرد و بدین سبب هیبتی از سلطنت او در دل خلق متمکن شد

Ṭ. N. 20. l. 9.

"He showed marked favour to no one and for this reason a proper awe of his regime (or royal dignity) became firmly fixed in the hearts of the people".

The feeble administrations of 'Abdur Rashīd and Farrukhzād had weakened the prestige of the monarchy. It was now restored and the subjects learnt to respect their ruler and stand in wholesome awe of the occupant of the throne.

II. 277, *l.* 11. ***When the intelligence of his accession reached Dāūd, the Seljūkī, he sent some nobles into Khurāsān, and made peace with him.***

چون خبر جلوس او بداؤد سلجوقی رسید در خراسان معارف
فرستاد و با او صلح کرد

Ṭ. N. 20. l. 10.

"When the news of his [Ibrāhīm's] accession reached Dāūd Seljūqī, in Khurāsān, he (Dāūd) sent some well-known persons and made peace with him (Ibrāhīm)".

Khurāsān was no longer in the hands of the Ghaznivides. They had lost it and ***Dāūd was the ruler of the country.*** The envoys were not sent to Khurāsān, but *from* Khurāsān to Ghaznīn. See Ṭ. N. Tr. Raverty, 132. See also *Habību-s-siyār*, Vol. I. II. iv. 82. l. 3 ff.

ذکر رسیدن سلطنت ممالک خراسان و عراق بطغرل بیک
محمد بن میکائیل بن سلجوق

See also Lane Poole. Muhammadan Dynasties, 151.

II. 278, *l.* 15. ***Taxes and imposts were remitted in all his dominions.***

This is badly expressed and the author can hardly mean that *all* taxation was abolished, as such a course would have resulted only in administrative chaos and financial bankruptcy.

و باج و باز کل نواحی ممالک بر بخشید

Ṭ. N. 22. l. 3.

"And the imposts called 'Bāj' and 'Bāz' were remitted within the entire boundaries of the kingdom".

'Bāj' and 'Bāz' are general terms for tributes, cesses, tolls, customs duties and other sources of revenue, but Richardson states that باژ is used also for "Some grievous imposition which distresses the poor and conquered". This is probably the meaning here and these باج و باژ must have been oppressive exactions or imposts which, on account of their falling heavily on the poor or vexatious mode of their collection were exceedingly unpopular. The ***Farhang-i-Anjuman Ārāi Nāṣirī*** defines باج as 'tribute paid to Kings' and also 'a tax levied on the roads from merchants'. This is the راهداری, which is said to have been remitted during a year of scarcity by Aurangzeb, along with the باج غلہ, the duty or tithe (عشور) on corn. (Khwāfī Khān, Text, II. 87. l. 5 from foot. 88. l. 11).

II. 279, *l.* 1. ***Bahrām Shāh, his (Arslān's) uncle, fled to Sulṭān Sanjar.***

The word in the body of the Text (22. l. 3 from foot) is عم but the variant برادر is given in the Note and it is undoubtedly correct. See the names of the sons of 'Alāu-d-dīn Mas'ūd Shāh in the Ṭ. N. Text 21 Footnote, last line.

II. 284, *l.* 3. ***He has written what he found in the Tārīkh-i-Nāṣirī and the Tārīkh-i-Haizam Nābi.***

A ***Tārīkh-i-Nāṣirī*** is cited elsewhere also by Minhāj and is described more explicitly as an "Abridgement of the ***Tārīkh-i-Nāṣirī***, which one of the great men of Ghaznī had compiled in the reign of Sulṭān Mu'izzu-d-dīn Muḥammad-i-Sām".

ملتخب تاریخ ناصری کہ یکی از اکابر غزنین در عہد سلطان غازي
معزالدین محمد سام × × پرداختہ است

Ṭ. N. 32. l. 6.

It cannot, therefore, have been the original work of Baihaqī, though it may have been a summary or potted version of the thirty مجلدات, which that author is said to have written on the history of the Ghaznivides.

II. 284, *l* 21. ***In Ghor, there are five mountains which the people of Ghor agree in considering as higher than the Rāsiyāt mountains.***

که از راسیات جبال عالم است

39. l. 5.

"Which are among the highest mountains [or mountain-peaks] in the world".

راس الجبل according to Richardson, means 'mountain-top'. Elsewhere, Minhāj speaks of the مضایق جبال و شعاب راسیات of the province of Salmūr or Sirmūr (Ṭ. N. 307. l. 3), that is, of the defiles of the mountains and the passes in the cliffs'. The *Ghiyāsu-l-Lughāt* says جبال راسیات means کوهہای بلند و استوار high and precipitous (lit. straight, and perpendicular) mountains.

II. 293, *l*. 10. ***This Takīnābād is the place which was the cause of the quarrel with the house of Mahmūd Subuktigīn and it passed into the hands of the Kings of Ghor.***

که سبب بر افتادن آل محمود سبکتگین بمنازعت و ضبط آن شهر بوده

است ... بدست سلاطین غور

115. l. 9.

"And the origin of the fall of the House of Maḥmūd-i-Subuktigīn was the quarrel about that city and its capture [lit. coming into the hands of] by the Sulṭāns of Ghor".

Or "And the origin of the destruction of the descendants of Subuktigīn at the hands of the Sulṭāns of Ghor was the contention for the possession of that city".

The first line of the quatrain is rendered by Dowson. "Thy father laid the foundation of this place", but اول پدرت نهاد کین را بنیاد means, 'Thy father was the first to lay the foundation of the *enmity* or *strife* کین or کینه.

II. 293, *l*. 7 from foot. ***Two years afterwards in 570 H.***

دوم سال این در شهور سنه سبعین و خمس مایه

In the ***second year*** after this, ***viz***. in 570 H. (Text, 116. l. 2). The year mentioned only three lines higher up (Text, 115. l. 20) is 569 H.

II. 294, *l.* 9 from foot. ***The Sultān returned to Lāhore in 581 H.***

The Text has 582 H. (117. l. 9), and so also Raverty (Tr. 455).

II. 295, *l.* 10. ***When the war with Khwārizm Shāh broke out......Khusrū Malik and his son were put to death.***

چون × × عصیان و فتنهٔ سلطانشاه خوارزمی ظاهر شد خسرو ملک
و پسرش را شهید کردند

(Ṭ. N. 118. l. 4).

When the revolt and disturbance raised by Sulṭān Shāh, the Khwārizmian (prince), broke out, Khusraw Malik and his son were put to death".

Sulṭān Shāh was not the ʿKhwārizmshāh, the real ruler or occupant of the throne of Khwārizm, but his insurgent brother, whose real name was Jalālu-d-dīn Maḥmūd. The Khwārizm Shāh's personal designation was ʿAlāu-d-dīn Takish and they were both sons of the Khwārizmshāh, Tyal Arslān (Ṭ. N. 73. l. 5 from foot; Raverty, Tr. Ṭ. N. 239–249 and 456 note).

II. 296, *l.* 18 from foot. ***He [Muʿizzu-d-dīn sām] retreated......leaving Kāzī Tolak in the fort of Sarhind.***

Here, as well as on l. 9 from foot of this page, the name should be read as تبرهنده, though the Text has سرهنده (118. l. 7 and 119. l. 2 from foot). Raverty says all his MSS read 'Tabarhindah'. (Tr. 457 Note and 464).

Tolak was a fort in the precincts حوالی of the Jibāl near Herāt (Ṭ. N. 62. l. 8 from foot).

II. 297, *l.* 1. ***When the enemy collected his forces to attack, they were to support each other and to charge at full speed.***

شما پشت میدهید و بتگ اسپ از پیش ایشان دور میشوید

120. l. 6.

'Then you should show your backs and quickly gallop away to a distance from them'. "You are to face about the distances of a horse's course infront of them" (R. 468).

The real meaning seems to be that they were to make a feigned retreat and tempt the Hindu host to pursue them. When the serried ranks of the enemy were thus broken and had fallen into disorder, the Muslims were to face about, attack them in a body and close in upon them.

The phrase پشت دادن lit. 'to give the back' or 'show the back' is not free from amphibology, but there can be little doubt that it means here '*show* their backs', 'turn their backs upon, fly, or retreat'. Minhāj himself uses it again in this sense.

چون طاقت مقاومت نداشتند بسبب آن پشت دادند

Ṭ. N. 222. l. 5.

Dowson renders it thus: "They were unable to withstand the troops of the Sulṭān, so they *turned their backs*". (E.D. II. 356). Baranī also speaks of the nobles of Jalālu-d-dīn Khaljī who had

ولی نعمتان خود را پشت داده بودند

Ṭ. F. 250. l. 5 from foot.

and Dowson states that "they had *deserted* their benefactor". (E. D. III. 162). Aḥmad Yādgār says در حملهٔ اول پشت داده رو بگریز آوردند

B. I. Text 182. l. 7. Elsewhere we read:

چون کفار بطرف تو آیند پشت داده بجانب ما بیا

Ibid, 210. l. 3 from foot. See also 59. l. 2 from foot.

Baihaqī writes پشت داد و بهزیمت برگشت (529. l. 10) and

هندوان سستی کردند و پشت بهزیمت دادند

Ibid. 533. l. 2 from foot.

II. 303, *l.* 4 from foot. *In the same year, the compiler of these leaves, Sirāj Minhāj (sic)......reached Ūch by boat on Tuesday, the 26th of the month of Jumāda-l-awwal A. H. 624 (April 1227).*

Raverty has Tuesday, the 27th (Tr. 541) and one MS gives it as 25th, Saturday. As 26th Jumāda I 624 was Friday, 14th May 1227 A.C. and 27th Saturday, there is a fairly strong presumption against the correctness of both these dates. Moreover, Minhāj himself declares elsewhere that he reached Ūchh in *Rajab* 624 H. (Ṭ. N. 172. l. 11, E. D. II. 325; Raverty, Tr. 611-2). Calculation shows that 27th Rajab 624 H. 13th July 1227 *was* a Tuesday and this *may be* the right date.

II. 305, *l.* 8 from foot. *Hizbaru-d-dīn Hasan. Read 'Hazabbru-d-dīn' or 'Hizabbru-d-dīn'.*

In this Translation of the Ṭ. N. (p. 549), Raverty has altered the sobriquet of this Amīr into ادیب and this conjectural emendation has been admitted into the C. H. I. (III 42), but it is clearly written ارنب

in the very old and beautifully-written MS of the *Tāju-l-Maāṣir* in the Mullā Firūz Library in Bombay. (Rehatsek's Catalogue, VII. No. 16) folios 195 b, l. 2. ff. and 196 a, l. 1 and the B. I. Text of the Ṭ. N. 147. l. 2.

II. 306, *l.* 10. *In the service of Bakhtiyār were two brothers of great intelligence.*

دو برادر بودند دانشمندان فرغانی ×× در خدمت محمد بختیار

147. l. 7 from foot.

"There were in the service of Muḥammad-i-Bakhtiyār two learned theologians [or masters of the religious law] from Farghāna, who were brothers".

These 'two wise brothers', as they are again called, (l. 16) were really *Ghāzīs* or *Murābiṭs*, religious enthusiasts who had joined the army as volunteers to qualify for Heaven by dying for the faith in a *jihād*. Minhāj himself speaks of them as "Ghāzīs who had resolved to stake their lives".

دو برادر دانشمند درمیان آن فوج غازیان جانباز بودند

147. l. 2 from foot.

On the meaning of دانشمند *vide* my Note in S. I. M. H. p. 157.

II. 308, *l.* 15. *The Turks had already taken Behār, and next year they would also attack his country, it was advisable to make peace with them.*

صواب آن است که رای موافقت نماید تا با جملهٔ خلق ازین مملکت نقل
کرده شود تا از فتنهٔ ترکان بسلامت بمانیم

150. l. 7

"That the Rāi should give his consent to transferring himself with all the people from this territory, so that we may remain safe against [or immune from] the tyranny of the Turks".

They did not advise the Rāi "to make peace with the Turks". They advised flight from the country, before the invaders arrived and asked him to join them in leaving this part of Bengal and emigrate in a body to a more distant and defensible part of the country.

II. 309, *l.* 12 from foot. *He [Muḥammad-i-Bakhtiyār] brought the surrounding places into his possession and caused his name to be read in the Khutba and struck on the coins.*

و خطبہ و سکہ در ہر خطہ قائم کرد

Ṭ. N. 151. l. 4 from foot.

"and had the *Khuṭba* and *Sikka* established in every district".

There is nothing corresponding to "his (own) name", in the Text. The Khuṭba was recited and the coins struck in the name of the Sulṭān Mu'izzu-d-dīn Sām. Muḥammad was a steadfastly loyal vassal of his sovereign, as is evinced by the story of his having repeatedly exclaimed during his catastrophic retreat, 'Has any misfortune befallen the Sulṭān-i-Ghāzī, Mu'izzud-din Muḥammad Sām, that my fortune has turned so bad'! (E. D. II. 313; Ṭ. N. Text 156. l. 13). No coins struck by him have yet been found.

II. 311, *l.* **6**. *The road lay for fifteen stages through the defiles and passes of the mountains and at the sixteenth stage level land was reached.*

شانزدهم روز بصحن زمین تبت وصول نمود

Ṭ. N. 153. l. 11.

"On the sixteenth day, he [Muḥammad-i-Bakhtiyār] arrived at *the frontier* [lit. courtyard], *of the territory of Tibet*". Dowson must have read the last word تبت very differently. Raverty renders it, "the open country was reached" Tr. 565.

II. 312, *l.* **3**. *Between Kāmrūp and Tibet there were thirty-five mountain passes through which horses are brought to Lakhnautī.*

Raverty insists that 'Tibet' is wrong, as some of his old copies have 'Tirhut' (p. 568). But Minhāj has never mentioned 'Tirhut' before. 'Tibet is repeatedly, (five or six times), stated to have been the country which was Muḥammad-i-Bakhtiyār's objective and the horses of the peculiar breed known as 'Tāngan', in connection with which the country is mentioned in this particular passage, are not found in Tirhut (North Bihār), but in Bhutān and Tibet.

"In the confines of Bengal near Kūch" (Assām), writes Abū-l-Faẓl, "another kind of horses occurs, which rank between the *Gūt* [the Gunt of Kumāūn] and Turkish horses, and are called *Tānghan*; they are strong and powerful" (*Aīn*. Tr. I. 133).

Hodges also states that "the small horses brought from the *eastern* side of Bengal are called *Tanyans*". (Travels in India during the years 1780–83, Ed. 1793, p. 31). Another old writer who visited Tibet in 1774, states that "the two *tangun* ponies" with which he was provided during his travels in the country, "though of a mean appearance,

turned out, on better acquaintance, to be patient and surefooted". (Sir C. R. Markham, Narrative of the mission of G. Bogle to Tibet, p. 17). The name itself is of Tibetan origin and is derived from *rTan*, which signifies 'horse' in that language. (Hobson Jobson, *s. q.*). The *Tangans* were brought from Tibet to Lakhnauti *via* Kāmrūp in Āssām. What Minhāj means is that as the animals had to cross no less than thirty-five mountain-passes which lay between Tibet and Kāmrūd (Western Āssām), از بلاد کامرود تا بلاد تبت سی و پنج دره کوه است the passage was exceedingly long and difficult.

II. 313, *l.* 3. *And all around the temple they were to stick their bamboo spears in the ground.*

و در دور بتخانه نی نیزه بر زمین فرو می بردند

Ṭ. N. 155. l. 7 from foot.

"And they stuck deep into the ground all round the idol temples stakes of bamboo" [so as to form a stockade]".

نی نیزه really means "the cane or reed of the spear" *i. e.* the particular species of reed or cane (نی), of which the handles or shafts of spears (نیزه) are made.

These shafts are made of the male or solid bamboo. The female or hollow variety of bamboo is useless for the purpose. The bamboo is often called قنا هندی 'the Indian Cane', in Arabic.

II. 315, *l.* 2 from foot. *He said to one of the Khiljī nobles, who was called Sālār-i-Zafar (victorious general).*

'Ẓafar' was his proper or personal name and he was the 'Sālār' *i. e.* Captain or leader of a small troop or body of horse. Shihābu-d-dīn Dimishqī tells us that in his time a "*Khān* had 10000 horse under his command, a *Malik* 1000, an *Amīr* 100 and *isfah-sālār* a still smaller number. He had also no right to approach the Sulṭān". (E. D. III. 577).

II. 317, *l.* 11. *He was driving a laden mule from Zāwalistūm to the highlands called Pasha-afroz.*

The word used is دراز گوش which is used for 'ass' as well as 'mule'.

Pasha afroz is meaningless and the variant پشتم فروز which is found in some MSS is an undoubted improvement. Raverty renders it 'Burning mound' (Tr. 580 note), but this interpretation can scarcely be correct. The mound or hillock was probably so called after some local celebrity named Firoz.

II. 318, *l.* 4 from foot. *The territory of Lakhnautī consists of two parts, on opposite banks of the Ganges. That to the west is called Dāl, the city of Lakhnautī is on this side. The eastern side is called Barbanda and the city of Deokot is on that side.*

Raverty characterises the statement made in the last line as totally impossible, because the City of Lakhnautī was on the *east* and not on west side of the Ganges. He states that the 'best copies' have 'Lakhnaur' and gives it as his own opinion that the right reading must be 'City of *Lakhnaur*', though he admits his inability to fix its situation. (Tr. 585 and Notes). But as 'Barbanda' (Bārind, *i. e.* Purnea, Dinājpūr, etc.) and Deokot are actually on the east side of the Ganges, the other district, lying on the opposite side, 'Dāl' (Rārh, *i. e.* Hūglī, Būrdwān, Bānkūra, etc.) and the town mentioned along with it *must* have been on the *west*. Now Lakhnautī or Gaur is certainly not in that direction and it cannot be the place meant. If Lakhnautī was on the east of the Ganges, Dāl (or Rārh) must also have been in the same direction, which is manifestly absurd and contrary to fact. 'Lakhnaur' is most probably right.

II. 320, *l.* 7 from foot. *His case was like that of Joseph.*

"They said, father, why do you not send Joseph with us (etc. upto) we will take care of him". *Vide* Qur'ān, Chap. XII. verses 1 to 15.

II. 321, *l.* 8 from foot. *A thousand dīnārs in refined gold was fixed as the price of each.*

The words are هزار دینار زر رکني (168. l. 8) and Raverty's rendering is a thousand dīnārs of pure Ruknī Gold' (Tr. 601). It is not clear why pure gold should be so called. Some Persian lexicographers trace the word to an alchemist [کیمیاگر] named Rukn who was able by his art to produce gold of absolute purity Others father it upon a person styled Ruknu-d-dīn who made pure gold current (زر خالص رائج کرد). Both derivations are obviously fictitious.

II. 322, *l.* 7. *Kutbu-d-dīn consigned to Nizāmu-d-dīn the management of the business and ordered him to take Jamālu-d-dīn, etc.*

نظام الدین محمد را سلطان قطب الدین بجهت اتمام مصالح خود در غزنین بگذاشت و فرمان داد کہ جمال الدین چست قبارا با خود بهندوستان بیار

T. N. 168. l. 6 from foot.

"Sultān Quṭbu-d-dīn left Nizāmu-d-dīn behind himself in Ghaznīn for the finishing (completing or final settlement) of several of his

affairs [مصالح] and ordered him to bring Jamālu-d-dīn Chustqabā to Hindūstān".

This was only one of many personal and political transactions which were left to the Wazīr to negotiate and complete. مصالح is a plural noun.

II. 323, *l.* 9. *He [Mu'izzu-d-din-i-Sām] called him [Iltutmish] into his presence and honoured him with special notice.*

وبتشريف خاص مشرف گردانيد

T. N. 169 last line.

"And honoured with the gift of his own personal robe [the robe which the Sulṭān himself wore]. It was also called خلعت خاص or ملبوس خاص. There were five degrees of *Khil'at*, those of "three, five, six or seven pieces and of clothes which the Emperor himself had actually worn". This last was "a special mark of favour" (Irvine, Army of the Indian Mughals, 29). A تشريف خاص is said to have been bestowed by Quṭbu-d-dīn Aibak upon Muḥammad-i-Bakhtīyār Khaljī after the latter routed the elephant in single combat (T. N. 148. l. 6) from foot). It is wrong to call it only 'a robe' as Dowson does. (II. 307).

II. 324, *l.* 16. *Jalālu-d-dīn, King of Khwārizm......came towards Hindustān and some fighting followed on the frontiers of Lāhore.*

وبسرحد هاى لوهور فتنهٔ خوارزمشاهيان رسيد

171. l. 13.

"And the disorders [disturbances, inroads, etc.] of the Khwārizm-shāhī armies extended as far as the frontiers of Lāhore".

The meaning is that these fugitives plundered, ravaged and harried the whole country upto the town of Lāhore.

II. 327, *l.* 15 from foot. *The fort (of Gwālior) was conquered on Tuesday, the 26th of Safar A. H. 630 (November, 1232). Some MSS give the weekday as Saturday.*

The corresponding Julian date was 12th December 1232 A. C.; but it was a Sunday.

II. 328, *l.* 2. *A halt of five days was called.*

I have shown in the note on this passage that the reference is to the orders which were given for striking the 'naubat' five times every

day. It may be pertinent to invite attention to an interesting and explicit reference to this highly-esteemed and jealously-guarded royal prerogative in Ibn-al-Balkhī's *Fārsnāma*, which was written so early as the first decade of the 6th Hijrī century. He states that a Seljūq chief named Namrūd who lived in the days of Bākālījar the Būyide, was, in sign of his high rank, wont to strike the Kettledrum five times. It then became a custom among these people and continued down almost to his own time. But it was forbidden by the Atābak Chāwulī, the successor of the Atābak Khummartigīn, who was the Atābak of Fars under the Seljūq Sulṭān Barqīaruq, the son of Malik Shāh. (Ed. G. Lestrange and R. A. Nicholson, Introduction, p. xi.)

II. 329, *l.* 6 from foot. *One year and a half after this [the reception of the Khil'at from the Khalīf of Baghdād], he [Nāṣīru-d-dīn Maḥmud] fell sick and died.*

There is some inadvertent blunder here. Minhāj has just stated that the dresses of honour were presented to Iltutmish on the 22nd of Rabīʻu-l-awwal 626 H. and that the news of the death of the Sulṭān's eldest son in Lakhnautī arrived in Jumāda-ul-awwal 626 H. (Text, 174. l. 10; E. D. II. 326). And here he avers that the mournful event took place a year and a half afterwards بعد از یک سال و نیم (Text, 181. l. 9). سال must be an error for ماه month.

II. 330, *l.* 1. *His mother, the queen of the world, Shāh Turkān, was originally a Turki handmaid.*

والدهٔ او خداوندهٔ جہان شاہ ترکان کنیزک ترک بود

181. l. 4 from foot.

Khudāwanda-i-Jahān is here a proper noun. It was her style and title. Her son had conferred it upon her, probably after his own accession. Cf. *Malika-i-Jahān*, *Khūnda Sultān*, *Khūnda Humāyūn*, Makhdūma-i-Jahān, which were all titles bestowed on their wives or mothers by reigning Sulṭāns.

II. 330, *l.* 16. *The princes and nobles placed Ruknu-d-dīn upon the throne on Tuesday, 29th of Sha'bān 633 H.*

Minhāj himself says that Iltutmish entered Delhi on the morning of Wednesday, 1st Shaʻbān (E. D. II. 328), but 1st Shaʻbān (Bookrule) was really a Thursday, 10th April, 1234. Raverty puts the death of Iltutmish on Monday, the 20th and Ruknu-d-dīn's accession on the 21st, but in that case, he must have sat on the throne on the very next day

after the demise of his father, which would be most unusual. The accession rarely takes place before the *Ziyārat* or third day's ceremony is performed. There are irreconcilable discrepancies in regard to the date of the death of Īltutmish. Several MSS of the Ṭ. N. give it as the 20th, or as Saturday the 20th (Ṭ. N. Tr. Raverty, 623 Note). The Ṭ. N. (Bibl. Ind. Text, 20. l. 3 from foot, 21. l. 7) and the Ṭ. A. declare that Īltutmish died on Monday the 20th of Sha'bān and that Ruknu-d-dīn was crowned on the third day after that event on Wednesday, the 22nd. On p. 332 of this volume, Minhāj states that Sulṭān Ruknu-d-dīn was put to death on Sunday, the 18th of Rabī'u-l-awwal 644 H. after a reign of 6 months and 28 days (Ṭ. N. Text 184. l. 10). If these averments are both correct, the date of Ruknu-d-dīn's accession must have been the 21st of Sha'bān and that of the death of Īltutmish the 20th. It may be as well to state that 18th Rabī' I 634 H. was *Wednesday*, 19th November 1236, not Sunday. The strange thing about these disconcertingly contradictory dates is that not one of the week-days associated with them works out correctly according to the Bookrule. The 1st of Sha'bān was not a Wednesday, but a Thursday, the 20th was not a Monday, but a Tuesday, the 21st not a Tuesday but a Wednesday, and the 29th not a Tuesday but a Thursday. They all point to the *Rūyyat* system having been followed by Minhāj.

II. 331, *l.* 15. *In the neighbourhood of Manṣūrpūr and Nārāin, (they killed Tāju-d-dīn Muḥammad etc.)*

There is an old village named Manṣūrpūr in the Bhawānīgarh *Taḥṣīl* of the Karmgarh *niẓāmat* of Patiālā State. It lies about twenty miles west of Patiālā town. Lat. 30°-22'N. Long. 76°-5'E. It is now known as Chhintanwāla, which is a station on the Rājpūra-Bhatinda branch of the North-Western Railway, about forty miles south-west of Rājpūra. [Punjab District Gazetteer, Vol. XVII A (Phulkian States), Ed. 1909, p. 195].

Manṣūrpūr is again mentioned in association with Sanām by Minhāj on p. 371 (Ṭ. N. Text. 300. l. 7 from foot) and in the Ṭ. M., in juxtaposition with Sanām and Pāil (Text. 130. l. 13, 191. l. 12 = E. D. IV. 11, 52).

There is another place of the same name about eight miles south of Maẓaffarnagar town, in the United Provinces. It is also a station on the North-Western Railway and it may be the place intended here, if Nārāin is Tarāin or Aẓīmābād-Tirauri.

The Manṣūrpūr which was near Sanām and Pāil must be the old village in Patīālā, near Chhintanwāla. It is the 'Munsurpoor' of Thornton.

II. 333, *l*. 5. ***He [Iltutmish] directed his secretary, Tāju-l-Malik, who was director of the government to put her name in writing as successor to the throne.***

تاج الملک محمود دبیر × × کہ مشرف ممالک بود

T. N. 185. l. 15.

"He directed his secretary, Tāju-l-*Mulk*, who was the *Mushrif-i-Mamālik*".

The assignment of this most important task shows that the *Mushrif-i-Mamālik* was one of the pillars of the State and next only to the Prime Minister. It would be more correct to describe him as 'Chancellor of the Exchequer', or 'Chief Controller of Finance', than as 'Director of the government'. See the note on E. D. II. 74. l. 3 in this supplement. In any case he could not have been the 'Chief Spy' or head of the secret Police.

II. 334, *l*. 13. ***Malik Jānī was slain in the neighbourhood of Bābul and Nakwān.***

Niẓāmu-l-Mulk Junaidī went into the mountains of Bardār and died there after a while.

I am now able to fix the position of 'Nakwān' (*i. e.* Noganwān) more precisely. It is situated ten miles north of Sirhind and is a station on the Sirhind-Rupār branch of the North-Western Railway. It lies about fifteen miles west of Pāil.

Bardār is more difficult to identify. The variant 'Sarmand-barādar' indicates that it was somewhere near Sirmūr and at p. 353, it is mentioned in juxtaposition with Pinjaur. The conjecture may be offered that it is Barbār, an old village in close proximity to Rupār. The place is also mentioned in the *Tārīkh-i-Mubārakshāhī* in connection with the alignment of one of the canals of Fīrūz Shah. *q. v.* my note on E. D. IV. p. 11, l. 17 in this volume.

Pāil, Noganwān, Rupār and Bardār are thus shown to have been situated in the neighbourhood of one another. Pinjaur which is associated with Bardār lies also in Patīālā, in the north-east corner of Sirhind, about twenty-five miles south-east of Rupār.

II. 335, *l.* 19. *On Thursday, the 19th of Ramazān, A. H. 637 (April 1240), Sultān Raziya returned to the capital......... On Wednesday, the 9th of the same month and year, she marched......towards Tabarhindh to put down the rebels.*

There is something evidently wrong here. The B. I. Text reads Thursday, 19th *Sha'bān*, not Ramazān (188. l. 7 from foot), and this is undoubtedly correct. See also Raverty's Tr. 645 and Note 8. Raẓiyya marched towards Tabarhinda on Wednesday, the 9th of Ramaẓān (Dowson himself states, only three lines lower down on this very page). According to the Book-rule, 19th Sha'bān 637 H. *was* Thursday, 15th March 1240, 9th Ramaẓān 637 H. was Tuesday, 3rd April, 1240. If Minhāj is right in stating that the 9th was a Wednesday, thirty days must have been accounted to Sha'bān and not twenty-nine as prescribed by the Book-rule.

II. 336, *l.* 11. *On Friday, the 6th of the month of Rajab A. H. 634 (March 1237),......the Karmatians......came to the Jāma' Masjid of Dehlī.*

6th Rajab 634 H. (Book-rule) was Thursday, 5th March 1237 A. C. Minhāj appears to have given the *Rūyyat* date here as in many other places.

II. 337, *l.* 13. *The date of this [Raziya's defeat] was the 24th of Rabī'u-l-awwal 638 A. H. (October 1240) and the Sulṭān Raziya was killed on the day following.*

The date of her death is given differently in the B. I. Text of the Ṭ. N. It puts the defeat on the 24th of Rabi' I and the death شہادت on Tuesday, the 25th of Rabī' II (190. l. 8 from foot). But elsewhere (p. 252. l. 9 from foot), the date of Altūniya's death is given as *Tuesday*, 25th Rabī' I, 638 H. These statements are obviously irreconcilable, though it is possible that Altūniya may have been killed on the very next day after the defeat and Raẓiyya about a month later.

25th Rabī' II *was* Tuesday, 13th November 1240. 25th Rabī' I was Sunday, 14th October, 1240.

II. 337, *l.* 11. from foot. *On Monday, the 27th of Ramazān, 637 (April 1240), they raised him [Mu'izzu-d-dīn Bahrām Shāh] to the throne.*

The book-rule date was equivalent to 21st April 1240 A. C. but it was a Saturday. Raverty has 28th Ramaẓān. (Tr. 649).

II. 346, *l.* 13 from foot. *He [Nāṣiru-d-dīn Maḥmūd] started from Bahrāich attended by......some careful men on horse and foot.*

با مبالغ مرد پایک و سوار

(209. l. 7), "with a large body of horse and foot". Minhāj uses the word again in this sense

در اول روز مبالغی مشهید و خستم شدند

(154. l. 14). 'During the first part of the day, a large number were killed and wounded'. On p. 240. l. 4 from foot, he writes

وهندو منهزم شد و مبالغی بدوزخ فرستاد

See also 358. l. 5 from foot.

مبالغ مغل بدوزخ رفت

II. 346. *l.* 3 from foot. *He crossed the river of Lāhore, from whence he sent a force to ravage the hills of Jūd and the provinces in the Indus.*

Dowson says in the footnote that "the Text has نندنہ Nandna, but this is evidently a mistake for سندہ Sindh or the river Indus, which agrees with what follows and with Firishta's statement". But Raverty is of just the contrary opinion. The passage is copied in the Ṭ. A. and the strange thing about it is that the B. I. Text reads

بکوہ جود و اطراف نندنہ فرستاد

(B. I. Text. I. 73 last line), while the Lithograph has سندہ (33. l. 4 from foot). F. prefers اطراف آب سندہ

(I. 71. l. 4), but he merely copied what he found in his Manuscript of the Ṭ. A. The *Tārīkh-i-Mubārakshāhī* reads نندنہ (Text, 35. l. 7).

II. 349, *l.* 11. *He [Malik Jalalu-d-dīn] all at once took alarm about these two districts (Sambhal and Budāun) and came to the capital.*

ناگاہ خوفی و سراسی بدو راہ یافت از سنبھل و بداون بحضرت پیوست

212. l. 14.

"Suddenly, terror and apprehension found their way into the heart of Jalālu-d-dīn and from Sambhal and Budāun, he came to the Capital".

Raverty remarks that "there was no cause of alarm *about these districts* and that the Capital was the place, above all others, that he would avoid". He says that a line has been dropped out in the printed text and that according to the best MSS, Jalālu-d-dīn proceeded

from Sambhal and Budāun towards Lāhore by way of the hills of Sihnūr [Ṣilmur?] (Tr. 684 and note).

II. 352, *l.* **2.** *On Monday, 22nd Shawwāl, he proceeded towards Lāhore and Ghaznī on the way to Uchh and Multān.*

Raverty contends (692 n) that غزنی is an absurd blunder for عزیمت, but غزنی is the reading found not only in the B. I. Text but in three of the best manuscripts and his pontifical pronouncement about "the impossibility of its being correct" may be safely ignored. It was common in those times to speak of the Punjāb and the territories westwards as the "Ghaznī frontier". The *Tārīkh-i-Mubārakshāhī* tells us that Sulṭān Firūz Tughlaq "appointed Tātār Khān *Shiqdār* from the boundary of Ghaznīn to Multān and keep him there".

تاتارخان را ازحد ولایت غزنین تا ملتان شقدار کرده در آنجا گذاشت

Text, 127. l. 10. = E. D. IV. 9. See also Ṭ. A. Lith. 115. l. 2 from foot B. I. Text, I. 231. l. 9.

There was a دروازهٔ غزنی 'Ghaznī Gate' in Delhī and it was so called, not because it was used only by those who were journeying to that town, but because it was most convenient exit and entrance for those who were going to or coming from any place situated to the north-west of the metropolis. Sulṭān Ruknu-d-dīn had the Ghaznī gate opened at midnight when he fled towards Multān, some time after the assassination of his father. (T. F. 246. l. 11 = E. D. III. 160; see also T. F. 281. l. 1: E. D. III. 177). It is mentioned also by Ibn Baṭṭūṭa (Defremery, III. 149).

Moreover, Raverty's contention that غزنین is a copyist's blunder will hardly commend itself to any one who tries to read عزیمت for غزنین in the sentence.

رایات اعلی بر سمت لوهور و غزنین از راه اُچه و ملتان نهضت فرمود

(Ṭ. N. 216. l. 10).

It does not fit in with the contents and is grammatically as well as idiomatically incorrect.

II. 352, *l.* **10 from foot.** *Malik Kishlī Khān was made Lord Chamberlain. Ulugh Mubārak Aibak......was* ***granted*** *the fief of Karra and was sent there.*

ملک کشلی خان امیر حاجب الغ مبارک ایبک را × × اقطاع کره دادند و بدان طرف روان کردند

Text. 217. l. 7.

"Malik KishlīKhān, Ulugh Mubārak Aibak, the Amīr-i-Ḥājib was given the fief of Karrah and he started in that direction".

'Ulugh Mubārak Aibak' was part of the style and titles of Kishlī-Khān himself. He was note *made* Chamberlain at this time. He was, on the contrary, deprived of that post. He had been appointed Amīr-i-Ḥājib, soon after the accession of Sulṭān Nāṣiru-d-dīn Maḥmūd. (Ṭ. N. 280. l. 1). He was now dismissed from that post and removed from the Court, like his brother, Ulugh Khān, and packed off to Karra. See Ṭ. N. 278–80. Tr. Raverty, 795–99.

He appears to have had a multiplicity of titles and is styled Malik Kishlī Khān, Saifu-d-dīn Ībak-i-Sulṭānī (Ṭ. N. 278. l. 11) and also 'Ulugh-i-A'ẓam-i-Bārbak' (Ṭ. N. Text. 220. l. 14; Raverty 702). He is also spoken of as Al Malik Al Kabīr Saifu-d-dīn Aibak Mubārak Bārbak (Ṭ. N. Text. 206. l. 12 = Raverty, 674).

II. 354, *l.* 11 from foot. *In Rabī'u-l-ākhir (653 H.), Malik Kutbu-d-dīn ......uttered something which was offensive to the Sultān, and on the 23rd of that month, he was arrested and placed in prison, where he was killed.*

The execution of this universally-esteemed grandee and statesman is passed over in the Ṭ. A., T. M. and F. but 'Iṣāmī gives it a very different complexion. He asserts that Quṭbu-d-dīn uttered some ﺟﺮﺑﮏ slander, indiscreet gibe, sneer or sarcasm about Ulugh Khān's over-grown power in the presence of the Sulṭān and that he was soon afterwards assassinated by the myrmidons of the Mayor of the Palace in the Sulṭān's own antechamber (*Futūḥ*, p. 154, verses 3023–3053). If this is true, the imbecile Nāṣiru-d-dīn has been saddled by Minhāj with the crime of his not too scrupulous minister.

II. 355, *l.* 3 from foot. *At the beginning of the following year, the army went to Santūr.......and penetrated as far as the town of Salmūr, in the defiles and fastness of the mountains.*

We are told by a local expert in an official publication that the ruins of 'Santūr' or 'Santaur' now lie at a place called 'Sindhūband' near Chhachhraulī, the capital of the modern state of Kālsia in the Ambālā district. [Sirmur State Gazetteer, (Ed. 1904), p. 11 note].

The old town of Salmūr (or Sirmūr) stood about ten miles north-west of 'Paunta' on the southern bank of the Girī river (*Ibid.* 113) 'Paunta' lies in Lat. 30°-45′ N. Long. 77°-40′ E. Nāhan, the modern

capital of the State, lies about twenty miles north-west of old Salmūr. Sirmūr is shown in the I. G. Atlas, Pl. 32, E. 2.

II. 356, *l.* 11 from foot. *A party of conspirators in the capital......had invited them [Qutlugh Khān etc.] to come to Delhī, where they would find the gates open and every one in the city ready to assist and support these proceedings.*

تا بحضرت آیند و دروازها بر ایشان دهند و در شهر هرکس را بدان
هرکس موافقت و بیعت می دادند و بدست راست عهد می ستدند

Ṭ. N. 223. l. 7.

"[The party of conspirators in the capital] had made every one in the city swear to cooperate with and support them in the movement and taken from them pledges or promises with the right hand".

The priests had used their influence with the laity to secure from them promises to aid and abet them in this revolutionary plot.

II. 356 last line. *When the storm had blown over and they returned to the capital, the Sultān might make an end of them.*

تااین فتنه آرام گیرد بشهر باز آیند از حضرت اعلی بنفی ایشان فرمان شد

223. l. 15.

"And that they should come back to the city (only) when these disorders subsided. Orders for expelling [banishing them from or prohibiting their stay in the city] were issued by His Majesty [in accordance with Ulugh Khān's proposal]. There is nothing about "making an end of them" in the original.

نفی means 'driving away, expulsion, proscription' (Richardson). Elsewhere, in his account of the same conspiracy, Minhāj uses the word اخراج (272. l. 5 from foot and 308. l. 3 from foot).

تا مخالفان را از شهر اخراج کند

II. 358, *l.* 14. *On Sunday, the 6th of Muharram (656 H.), the Sultān marched with his army from Dehlī.......On Wednesday, the 4th of the same month, Hulāgū.........was defeated before the gates of Baghdād.*

But if the 6th was a Sunday, how could the 4th have been a Wednesday? The B. I. Text gives the first date in the very same way, but puts Hūlāgū's defeat on Wednesday, the 9th (Ṭ. N. 225. l. 13). This is undoubtedly correct. As 1st Muḥarram 656 H. was according to the Bookrule Tuesday, 8th January 1258 A. C., the 6th must have been a Sunday and the 9th a Wednesday. See also Raverty. 711. He also makes it 9th.

II. 360, *l*. 5. *Ulugh Khān-i-a'zam belonged to the stock of the Khāhāns of Albarī.*

The B. I. Text has 'Khānān' خانان (281. ll. 6 and 8), and this is no doubt, correct. See Raverty's Tr. 800 and Note.

"*Khāqān* is really a form of Qāān, which was originally the peculiar title of the supreme sovereign of the Mongols, while the subordinate princes of the Chaghatāī and other Chingīzī lines were styled only 'Khān'. × × × The meaning of Khāqān, Sir H. Yule considered to be 'Khān of Khāns' [Marco Polo, Intro. pp. 9–10; see also Dr. Terrien de Lacouperie in Babylonian and Oriental Record for 1888" (*Tār. Rash.* Tr. 30 Note].

II. 360, *l*. 12 from foot. *He [the Almighty] therefore.........separated Ulugh Khān from his race and kindred......for the purpose of curbing the Mughals.*

از تخمه و تبار و میان قبائل و اقربا
بواسطهٔ استیلای مغل بدان دیار جدا افگند

281. l. 15.

"He [the Almighty] threw him into that country and seperated him from his race, family, tribesmen and relatives, because his own country had been conquered by the Mongols (*i. e.* for saving him *from* the Mongols, for protecting him against the Mongols, who would otherwise have destroyed and made an end of him.

The object of this providential intervention was to put him beyond the reach of the Mongols. He was spirited away to India to preclude the possibility of their destroying him, not to enable him 'to curb' them.

II. 361, *l*. 2. *The King made him his personal attendant, placing, one might say, the hawk of fortune on his hand.*

او را خاصه داری فرمود گوئی که شهباز دولت بر دست او نهاد

(282. l. 6).

'Khāṣadār' means here 'keeper of the Sultān's favourite hawk or falcon'. So, when Balban was subsequently made *Amīr-i-Shikār*, Minhāj writes that this was also a presage of the future. "Fate thus proclaimed that the earth was to be the prey [شکار دولت] of his fortune and the world the game [صید مملکت] of his sovereignty". Lastly, when he was made Master of the Horse, we are told that this was to prognosticate that "the steeds of sovereignty and empire [مراکب ملک و سلطنت]

had come under his bridle and control". These plays upon words indicate that خاصہ دار means 'Chief Falconer'.

Baranī uses the word in this sense and states that as Sulṭān Balban was inordinately fond of the chase, masters of the hunt میرشکاران obtained high honours and dignities in his reign and

خاصه داران و مهتران شکره داران را عزتی تمام پیدا آمده

T. F. 54. l. 7 from foot.

'Falconers and the superintendents of the keepers of hawks came to be held in great respect'.

The poet Iṣāmī also states that when Balban was purchased by Iltutmish, he was first sent to the stables as an under-groom, but afterwards appointed to look after the hawks or sakers.

بفرمود غمخواري اشکره

Futūḥu-s-Salāṭīn, p. 118, v. 2350.

Raverty renders it as 'personal attendant', in the body of his work, but takes care to state in a note that the word was "formerly applied to a soldier whose arms were furnished by his master" and "in more recent times, to the bearer of the betel box", also. He thinks that in this passage, it signifies "a page, henchman or personal attendant, perhaps a falconer". (Ṭ. N. Tr. 802 Note). But the above quotations from Baranī and 'Iṣāmī show that there is no room for hesitation or for a bewildering multitude of alternative meanings, which can serve only to perplex the reader. The post of *Khāṣadār* is mentioned in another of his biographies also by Minhāj. He states that it was the first duty assigned after purchase to Tāju-d-dīn Arslān Khān also and that he was made *chāshnīgīr* (Taster) after some years. (Ṭ. N. 265. l. 7 from foot).

II. 363, *l.* 10. ***There was a eunuch (in command) of the fort, who belonged to the household of Tāju-d-dīn. Abū Bahr Kabīr Khān Āhsunhar was Chief Justice and Muhhlisu-d-dīn was Kotwāl.***

در آن حصار خواجهٔ سرای بود از جملهٔ خدم تاج الدین ابو بکر کبیر خان
آقسنقر نام امیرداد بود و مخلص الدین کوتوال

287. l. 6 from foot.

The names and titles have been sadly jumbled up and confused. "In that fortress, a eunuch of the name of Āqsunqar, who was one of the slaves of Tāju-d-dīn Abū Bakr, [the son of] Kabīr Khān, was the Chief Justice [امیرداد]. Mukhliṣu-d-dīn was the castellan or commander of the Fort [کوتوال]".

In Raverty's version, the Kotwālship is given to Mukhliṣu-d-dīn and the *Dādbakī* to Āqsunqur, but the former is described as a eunuch and servant of Malik Tāju-d-dīn Abū Bakr and the latter as the slave of his father, Kabīr Khān-i-Ayāz (p. 810).

Elsewhere, Minhāj explicitly states that Tāju-d-dīn Abū Bakr was the son of Malik Kabīr Khān-i-Ayāz, and that when he was governor of Ūchch and Sind after the death of his father, he inflicted many defeats near Multān in 639 H. on the Qarlughs who had invaded that city (Ṭ. N. 235. l. 5 from foot).

II. 369, *l.* 6. ***When they returned from Kālinjar, they were encountered by this Rānā of Ijāri, who seized upon the defiles of the river Sindī in the road of the returning army.***

اين رانه سر راه لشکر اسلام در مضائق از آب سندی بگرفت

Ṭ. N. 297. l. 3.

This passage is rendered very differently in Raverty's translation. "The Rānah had seized the route of the Musalman forces in the narrow ravines leading from the (banks of the) river Gārānah (or Kārānah)" (Tr. 825). Raverty states in his Note on the counterpart-passage in the Biography of Nuṣratu-d-dīn Tābasī (or Tāyasī), that 'Karānah' or 'Garānah' is the reading he has found here "in all the oldest copies", and it is the "more modern copies" only which have 'Sindī' in its stead. But no such river as Kārānah or Gārānah is known in these parts and the difficulty is not solved by the hypothetical suggestion or surmise that 'Kārānah' and 'Sindī' may be one and the same or that the first is the *proper* name and 'Sindī' the general, as it is derived from سند 'river' (Ṭ. N. Tr. 733 Note).

کرانه means 'shore, coast, margin, bank'. If کرانه is right what Minhāj most probably wrote was در مضائق کرانهٔ آب سندی بگرفت 'in the narrow defiles on the bank of the river Sindī'. کرانه is used very frequently in this sense in association with the name of some river in these old chronicles.

Baihaqī has کرانهٔ جوی بزرگ 540. l. 12. کرانهٔ رود هیرمند 629. l. 4 from foot and بکرانهٔ رود رسانید 630. l. 8 from foot. Shams-i-Sirāj speaks of کرانهٔ لب آب کوسی 110. l. 10, 122. l. 13 and of the کرانهٔ آب آب سنده 199. l. 11, 236. l. 8, the T. M. of کرانهٔ آب سرد (Text, 54. l. 2) from foot and Budāunī of کرانهٔ آب لهور I. 131. l. 7.

I may say that in the Life of Nuṣratu-d-dīn Tābasī also in the B. I. Text, there is no mention of any river called 'Girāna' or 'Kirāna'. The words used there are :

سر راه لشکر اسلام بگرفت و در مضائق اورهای عمیق راه بند کرد

Ṭ. N. 240. l. 8.

II. 370, *l.* 4. *On Saturday, the new moon of Muḥarram, 651 H.* روز شنبہ سلخ محرم *Saturday, the last day of Muḥarram* (*Text 298. l. 11*).

Raverty has "Tuesday, the last day of the month of Muḥarram" (Tr. 826) and this is the correct weekday.

سہ has been inadvertently left out by the copyist. 30th Muḥarram 651 H. was Tuesday, 1st April 1253 A. C. according to the Indian Ephemeris.

This word سلخ is again misrendered as 'beginning' or 'new moon' on p. 367. l. 15 and p. 374. l. 2 from foot of these Extracts from the Ṭ. N. (See Text, 292. l. 10; 305. l. 3) and the same correction is applicable there.

II. 371, *l.* 6. *At the opening of the year 651 H. Read 652, as in the Text, 299. l. 5 from foot.*

Events which occurred in Rajab and Shawwāl 651 H. have been recorded before on p. 370 of Dowson's translation. On p. 372. l. 6, 26th Ramaẓān 652 H. is said to have been a Monday, which was Monday 9th November 1254.

II. 371, *l.* 14 from foot. *They suffered so much from the hands of the bullies who were retained by 'Imādu-d-dīn that for six months they could not leave their houses, etc.*

This is **really said** by Minhāj about himself

حال این ضعیف برین جملہ بود کہ از دست جور آن جماعت × × مدت
ششماہ یا زیادت آن بود کہ از وثاق بیرون آمدن و بنماز جمعہ رفتن
مجال نداشت تا حال دیگران کہ هریک از ترکان و ملکان جهانگیر × ×
بودند درتعب آن مذلت چہ بودہ باشد

(Ṭ. N. 300. l. 7).

Minhāj is describing *his own* sufferings.

"The state of this humble individual was in this wise that for six months or more, he was unable, on account of the violence of that body of men, to leave his house or go out of it for Friday prayers. What then must have been the miserable condition of those others, who had all been Turkī chiefs and *Maliks* who had conquered countries, under such humiliating tyranny".

II. 372, *l.* 4. *The author of this book started from the capital for the royal camp, which was stationed in the city, near the royal residence.*

This is loosely worded and is liable to be misunderstood by and even to mislead the reader.

این داعی از حضرت عزیمت لشکرگاه اعلی کہ در شہر بردرگاه اعلی مقام می
بود روز دوشنبہ بیست و ششم ماه رمضان بالشکرگاه اعلی رسید

Ṭ. N. 300 last line.

"The camp of the Sulṭān was somewhere between Tabarhinda and Sunām. It was not stationed anywhere in or near the city (of Dehlī). The author says that he left Ḥaẓrat-i-Dehlī and arrived at the Sulṭān's Court near Sunām on the 26th of Ramaẓān 652 H. The B. I. Text is undoubtedly faulty and makes no sense as some words have been left out by the copyist. Raverty translates the sentence thus :

"The author set out from the capital for the purpose of joining the royal Camp, *because it was impossible for him to remain in the city (of Dehlī) without* the presence of the sublime court". (Tr. 830). The italicized words indicate that he must have read

این داعی از حضرت عزیمت لشکرگاه اعلی [کرد] کہ در شہر بی
درگاه اعلی مقام نمی بود

II. 373, *l.* 9. *He sent one of the Chief attendants of the chamberlain, Sharfu-l-mulk Rashīdu-d-dīn Hanafī to Ban Khān.*

الغ خاص حاجب شرف الملک رشید الدین حنفی را نزدیک بنخان فرستاد

302. l. 12.

Sharfu-l-mulk was not one of the attendants of the chamberlain, but one of the four Chamberlains, (خاص حاجب) himself. The meaning is that "[Ulugh Khān] sent the Ulugh Khāṣ Ḥājib, Sharfu-l-Mulk to warn Bankhān". Ibn Baṭṭūṭa tells us that there were four officers styled *Amīr-i-Ḥājib, Khāṣ Ḥājib, Sayyidu-l-Ḥujjāb* and *Sharfu-l-Ḥujjāb* at the court of Muḥammad Tughlaq. The *Amīr-i-Ḥājib* ranked highest in this hierarchy and the others came after him in the order in

which they are mentioned (Defrémery. III. 221; See also *Ibid*. III. 225, 288–9). Minhāj has told us that Balban's brother was ***Amīr-i-Ḥājib***, and this man is said to have been the *Khāṣ Ḥājib*.

Mīrān Ṣadr is said to have been the *Khāṣ Ḥājib* of Mubārakshāh, the son of Khiẓr Khān. (T. M. Text. 232. l. 7 from foot). See also the note on E. D. IV. 78. l. 12 from foot in this supplement.

Baranī states that an *amīr* named ʿIṣāmī was the *Khāṣ Ḥājib* of Sulṭān Balban (T. F. 36. l. 3 from foot) and another noble who occupied that post under ʿAlāu-d-dīn Khaljī was sent by the latter to the fort of Narānīya with orders to massacre all those Mongols who had been taken captive and imprisoned there (*Ibid*. 322. l. 4; 241. l. 12). ʿIāmī also mentions that Aḥmad Chap was appointed *Ḥājib-i-Khāṣ* by Sulṭān Jalālu-d-dīn Khaljī (*Futūḥ*, p. 197, verse 3856).

The *Tārīkh-i-Mubārakshāhī* states that Malik Qaiṣar was the *Khāṣ Ḥājib* of Quṭub-d-dīn Mubārakshāh. (Text. 83. l. 3) and Bashīr Muʿizz *Nāib-i-Khāṣ Ḥājib* (*Ibid*. l. 4). Shams-i-Sirāj states that Mʿarūf, the son of Khwāja Waḥīdu-d-dīn Quraishi was the *Saiyidu-l-Ḥujjāb* of Fīrūz Tughlaq.

II. 377, *l*. 3. ***Just at this juncture, some meddle-some servants of the court at Dehlī wrote letters etc.***

بوالفضولان دستار بند از حضرت دهلی × × مکتوبات درقلم آوردند

308. l. 10.

"Some impertinent, intriguing turbanwearers (lawyers, theologians, *Qāẓīs*, *Maulavīs*, *Muftīs* or *faqīḥs*) of (*i. e*. residing in) the Seat of Sovereignty, Dehlī, wrote letters (to the rebel leaders).

The دستار or عمامه, the long and voluminous turban was worn only by the ʿUlamā or men learned in the Law.

II. 377, *l*. 10 from foot. ***I would bring over all the chiefs and nobles who were with Balban and would arrange matters in respect of other officers.***

جمله ملوک و امراء بلبن را بخدمت آرم و در سلک
دیگر بندگان مرتب گردانم

Ṭ. N. 309. l. 7.

The latter half of of the sentence really means, "I will get them" (the partisans of ***ʿIzzu-d-dīn*** Balban) drawn up in line with (or on the same side as) the other (loyal) servants (of the Sulṭān), *i. e*. induce them to desert the faction of Malik ʿIzzu-d-dīn Balban and range themselves with the ʿKing's friends', under the *other* Balban.

دیگر بندگان does not mean 'other officers', but all the *other* Amīrs who had stood loyally by the King, as opposed to the rebels.

II. 378, *l.* 9. *When the letter was delivered to the officers of Balban, the wise among them perceived its drift and knew that the dissensions between the nobles and generals would be settled elsewhere (Yakjā).*

عاقلانرا مزاج معلوم شد کہ حال مخالف میان امرا و ملوک مامور یکجا رسد

Ṭ. N. 309. l. 2 from foot.

"Those who were wise came to know the real temper [or situation or mental reactions] of the parties and divined how this affair [or contest] between the insurgent Amīrs and the Maliks who were under the command or orders (مامور) of the Sulṭān [and Ulugh Khān] would end".

یکجا is, I think, a mistake for بکجا. Cf. Raverty. 843.

II. 378, *l.* 9 from foot. *When their general brought in this army, Malik Balban went to them of necessity and the forces of the fort of Multān fell back.*

و ملک بلبن چون شحنۂ آن جماعت آورده بود بضرورت نزدیک ایشان رفت و کنگرهای حصار ملتان فرو رفتند

Ṭ. N. 310. l. 9.

"As Malik ['Izzu-d-dīn Kishlū Khān] Balban had himself brought a commandant [شحنہ] of that tribe [the Mongols], he had of necessity to go near them [*i. e.* to their camp], and the battlements of the fort of Multān were dismantled" (by the invaders). He had himself invited them and asked them to send a Commissioner of their own to take charge of the province. He naturally went to their military head quarters and joined them.

II. 380, *l.* 8. *Ulugh Khān now very properly used his influence in favour of his nephew, Sher Khān.*

پسر عم 'uncle's son' in the Text, 312 last line. Dowson himself says on p. 360 that "Ulugh Khan's father and the father of Sher Khān were born of the same father and mother". Sher Khān was Balban's cousin.

II. 381, *l.* 3. *Orders were given that the embassy from Hulākū Mughal was to halt:at Marūta.*

This place-name is difficult to fix, as there are at least three variants, Nārūya, Barūta and Barūna. Raverty says that eight out of his nine Manuscripts favour the second of these variants (Ṭ. N. Tr. 851 note). It may be the 'Barouth' of Thornton and the 'Barot' of Constable's Atlas, Pl. 25 B. C. It is now in Meerut district, and lies about twenty miles North-west of Delhī in Lat. 29°–6′ N. Long. 79°–20′ E. There is a large caravanserai here and it may have been a place of some importance on the road to Dehlī.

II. 381 last line. *And six bags of tankas......were taken from the Rānās of the hills and the Rāīs of Sind and sent to the royal treasury.*

و شش بدره تنکه × × از رانگان مواضع جبال و رایان سنده بخزانهٔ اعلی رسانید

315 last line.

Raverty says سنده is an error for ستده 'extorted, taken by force'. The six bags were *taken* from the Rānās of the villages in the Hills and the Rāīs and remitted to the royal treasury. (*Tab. Nāṣ.* Tr. 853 and Note).

There can be no question of any Rāīs of Sindh having been involved in this campaign. It was waged really against the Mewātīs in the hills near the capital and against their chief named Malka, who is stated to have harried the camels and carried off into slavery the people residing in Ulugh Khān's *Jāgīr* of Hānsī. His ravages are said to have extended on the north from Dehlī to Hariānā and the Siwāliks and in the South to Bayānā and Ranthambhor. In the circumstances, any reference to either Sind, the province or the river Indus is inconceivable and absurd.

II. 382, l. 17. *Ulugh Khān now represented that the Mughal ambassador in Khurāsān should be brought to Court and be granted an interview.*

که رسل خراسان را صواب باشد که بحضرت آورده شوند و دست بوس اعلی دریابند

Ṭ. N. 317. l. 12.

"[Ulugh Khān represented] that it would be advisable for the ambassadors *from Khurāsān* to be brought to the capital and permitted to kiss the hands of His Majesty". The word is in the plural رسل and they were not ambassadors *in* Khurāsān, but envoys who had arrived *from* that country.

The date, Wednesday, 7th Rabīʿu-l-awwal should be 8th Rabīʿu-l-Ākhir as it is in the Text (317. l. 14). Minhāj has stated that the army returned to the capital on 24th Rabīʿ I and the executions and flayings of the Mīwātī rebels were carried out two days afterwards. 8th Rabīʿ II 658 H. was Tuesday, 23rd March 1360, according to the bookrule (Ind. Ephem).

II. 549, *l.* 23. *Sultān Jalālu-d-dīn Mankburnī.*

In the note on this sobriquet in (S. I. M. H. 240–1), I have cited three examples of the application of the Persian synonym هزار مرد to men distinguished for heroism. I beg permission to quote another from the ***Fārsnāma*** of Ibn al Balkhī. That author tells us that when Khusrav Parvīz appealed to the Kaiṣar of Rūm for help, the latter sent an army under a leader تیادوس *Thiadūs* [Theodosins ?], "a great warrior who had been placed on a level with [*i. e.* was believed to be a match for] a thousand men".

مبارزی که اورا باهزار مرد برابر نهاده بودند

(Ed. Lestrange and Nicholson, 102. l. 11).

VOL. III. THE SLAVE, KHALJI AND TUGHLAQ DYNASTIES.

III. 5, *l*. 13. *Ḥaidar Rāzī, in his General History, says that the portion [of Rashīdu-d-dīn's Jāmi'u-t-tawārīkh] which relates to India was completed in A. H. 703, the period when our author [Waṣṣāf] received orders to commence his researches. Still it is evident that he copies from Waṣṣāf who wrote upon his Indian History down to 710 A. H.*

But it may be just the other way. We know that Rashīdu-d-dīn personally visited India, which Waṣṣāf does not appear to have ever done. The late Sir Albert Houtum-Schindler possessed a manuscript containing "some fifty letters addressed by Rashīdu-d-dīn to many different people on many different subjects. The twenty-ninth missive in this unique collection was written from Multān in Sind to Maulānā Qutbu-d-dīn of Shīrāz. The writer complains that he had been compelled to undertake a troublesome journey to India at the whim of Arghūn Khān, the Mongol, who wished him to impress on the Indian Kings and princes the power and greatness of his master. × × × He expresses satisfaction at the success of his mission and his approaching return home and incidentally describes how he succeeded, without offending Sulṭān 'Alāu-d-dīn to whom he was accredited, in remonstrating with him on his excessive indulgence in wine the remonstrance being rendered so palatable by an entertaining anecdote and some appropriate verses, that his royal host, instead of being annoyed, assigned to him and his son after him a handsome pension." (E. G. Browne, Lectures on Arabian Medicine, 105–106). Abū-l-Faẓl states (*Āīn*, II. 206, l. 5 from foot = Tr. III. 348) that "Sulṭān Muḥammad Khudābandah sent the author of the *Jāmi'u-t-tawārīkh-i-Rashīdī* on an embassy to Sulṭān Quṭbu-d-dīn, son of Sulṭān 'Alāu-d-dīn," but as Arghūn Khān died on 3rd Rabī' I, 699 H. (*Rauẓatu-s-ṣafā*, II. *Jild* V. p. 144, l. 3). Rashīd must have been in India before that date. Abū-l-Faẓl appears to have picked up the fact somewhere in the course of his reading, but is mistaken in regard to the details, the time of the embassy, and the names of Sulṭāns by whom and to whom it was sent.

III. 13, *l*. 12. ***A concise history of the Sultān Mahmūd Subuktigīn, the Ghaznivides, the Sāmānides, the Būwaihides, and some others to the time of Abūl Fath Maudūd bin Mas'ūd, and the year of his death, viz. the 547th of the Flight.***

There is an egregious chronological error here. Maudūd *bin* Mas'ūd died in 441, not 547 H. It was Bahrām Shāh Ghaznavī, a distant descendant of Mas'ūd, who died in 547 H. Some authors speak of him as the last ruler of the Ghaznavide dynasty. His successors Khusrau Malik and Khusrau Shāh had no real power and were mere pageants. Rashīdu-d-dīn is not responsible for the error. Dowson has copied it from Elliot who was misled by a statement originating from an extra-ordinary oversight of Mr. Morley's (Rieu, I. 74 sq; Ethe', T. O. L. C. Col. 1526, Ms. No. 2828).

III. 31, *l*. 5 from foot. *The winter cultivation is brought about only by the moistness of dew, called bārasī.*

The word 'bārasī' has no such meaning in the vernaculars and a reference to the text proves it to be a misreading. The sentence is worded thus in the old and now very rare edition of Waṣṣāf's work which was lithographed at Bombay in 1269 H. (1853. A. C.), p. 301, l. 10 from foot.

زراعت غلات شتوی را بنداوت ابخره کہ شبنم نام پارسی آنست میکنند

"And the cultivation of winter-cereals depends upon [lit. is made from] the natural humidity which is called 'Shabnam' [i. e. moisture of the night, night-dew] *in Persian.*" بارسی is evidently a perversion of پارسی.

III 33, *l*. 12 from foot. *They [the Indians] give them (the horses) roasted barley and grain.*

Here, 'grain' must be a mistake for 'gram' as the word used is نخود (pulse, vetch), in the Lith. 302, l. 13. The responsibility for the error probably lies with the printer.

III. 35, *l*. 4 from foot. *The correspondence in the Arabic between Jamālu-d-dīn and Sultān Alī bin Huzabbaru-d-dīn Mūwaiyyid will show the consideration on which he was held.*

What is really said is very different :

و این مکتوب در شهور سنه سبع عائه از زبان ملک اعظم فخرالدین

احمد ابن ابراهیم بجناب سلطان علی ابن هزبرالدین موئد در جواب

تقفی اشکره و سپارش طائفه ازمعتمدان او در مدینه الاسلام کاتب

Lith. 303, l. 10. را اتفاق انشاء افتاده بود درین موضع ثبت کرده شد

"And this letter addressed or written in the name of [lit. from the tongue of] Malik-i-A'ẓam Fakhru-d-dīn, the son of Aḥmad, to

H. H. Sulṭān ʿAlī, the son of Hazhabbaru-d-dīn Mūyyid in A. H. 700, in reply to one preferring a request for hawks and recommending a party of his confidential servants, which the author happened to compose [or *copy*] *in Medīna is transcribed below*".

The original letter which fills six pages (303-309) is then reproduced in the original Arabic.

III. 37, *l.* **17.** *Sultān Shahābu-d-dīn Ghorī who was slain by some Hindu devotees in the year 602 H.*

The words used in the original are بر دست چند هنود فدائي p. 310, l. 4, "at the hands of some Hindu *Fidāīs*", which may mean, 'desperadoes of the Ismaʿili sect, who were originally inhabitants of Hindustān'.

III. 37, *l.* **26.** *His* [*i. e. Īltutmish's*] *slaves......Sankez Khān, Aibak Khitāi, Nūr Beg and Murād Beg ʿAjamī forgot their gratitude to their old master.*

Here, سنكز 'Sankez' must be a copyist's error for سنقر or سنكر *Sunqur*. The noble meant must be Sherkhān *Sunqur*. Minhāj says that Sherkhān *Sunqur* went to Turkistān and sought refuge with Mangū Khān and the Mongols, in 651 H. (Ṭ. N. 217, last line = E. D. II 353; Ṭ. N. 277, l. 15, Tr. Raverty, 695, 792).

Aibak Khiṭāī is mentioned by Minhāj, who calls him 'Sanjān (or Ban Khān or Bat Khān). Aibak-i-Khiṭāī (Ṭ. N. 222, l. 14 = E. D. II 356; Tr. Raverty, 699. See also Ṭ. N. Text, 259, l. 4 = Raverty, 758).

'Nūr Beg' is not so easily identified. The name is, most probably, a *tashīf* or diacritical error of يوزبك Yūzbak. The person intended may be Ikhtiyāru-d-dīn. Yūzbak-i-Tughril Khān, q. v. Ṭ. N. 261-5; Raverty, 761-66.

Murād Beg 'Ajami' cannot be traced in the Dehlī histories, though an Amīr named Arkalī (not 'Az Kulli', as in Raverty, 788) Dādbak Saifu-d-dīn Shamsī 'Ajamī' is mentioned by Minhaj (Ṭ. N. 274-276). But in the lithographed text of Waṣṣāf, the first name is spelt مرداد, which must be meant for میرداد or امیرداد and is another form of دادبک (*Dādbak*). We may be thus sure that the person meant is this Amīr-i-Dād or Dādbak Saifu-d-dīn Shams-i-ʿAjamī.

III. 38, *l.* **10.** *Jalālu-d-dīn then took possession of the hills and the passes which led to them and Sodra, which were then in the occupation of the Mughals.*

پس جلال الدین حدود کوهاؤور و کوجہ و سودره را کہ ایل مغول بودند در تصرف گرفت

Text, 310, l. 9 from foot.

"Then Jalālu-d-dīn took into his own possession *Lohāwar* and *Girjhā* (*K*) and Sodra which were then subject to the Mongols." کوهاوور is, I think, a mistake for لوهاوور Lohāwwar; the copyist has muddled the real name by adding unnecessarily an upward stroke to the first letter. کوجہ or کوجاه occurs in the *Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī* in juxtaposition with نندنہ and Siālkōt (Text. 179, l. 2 from foot and 253. l. 1). There can be little doubt that the second letter is ر and not و and that the right reading is گرجہ or گرجاه *i. e.* Girjhāk. See my Note on E. D. IV. 390. l. 16 in S. I. M. H. 459.

III. 39, *l.* 5 from foot. *[Mu'izzu-d-dīn Kaiqubād was put to death] on the night preceding the 8th of Shawwāl 689 H. (October 1290 A. D.).*

The *Tārīkh-i-Mubārakshāhī* gives 19th Muḥarram, 689 H. (B. I. Text. 59, l. 2 from foot) and is followed by Budāūnī (Text. I. 165 = Tr. Ranking, I. 228). Waṣṣāf's 8th Shawwāl is almost certainly wrong, as Amīr Khusrav gives the exact date of the accession of Sulṭān Jalālu-d-dīn Khaljī as Tuesday, the 3rd of the second Jumādi 689 H. (E. D. III. 536), and the week-day works out correctly.

As Shamsu-d-dīn Kaiomaraṣ is said to have ruled in name for about three months after the death of his father (in Muḥarram) (Futūḥu-s-Salāṭin, verse 3922; T. M. 60, l. 6), 19th Muḥarram for the termination of the reign of Mu'izzu-d-dīn is fairly in accord with 3rd Jumādī II for that of the accession of Jalālu-d-dīn. These two dates appear to corroborate and supplement each other and both may be presumed to be correct.

III 40, *l.* 2. *Malik Firoz [Jalālu-d-dīn Khaljī] ascended an inauspicious throne on Friday, 25th Zilhijja (December), of the same year (689 H.).*

Amīr Khusrav gives Tuesday the 3rd of the second Jumādī 689 H. Calculation shows that the week-day given by the poet is correct. The Julian correspondence was Tuesday, 13th June 1290. 25th Zī-l-ḥijja 689 H. was Friday, 29th December 1290.

The *Tārīkh-i-Mubārakshāhī* puts Jalālu-d-dīn's accession into Rabī'u-l-ākhir 689 H. (Text. 61 last line), which differs but little from the date given by the poet.

III. 47, *l.* 5. *In the year 708 H., 'Alī Beg Gūrgān......marched to Hindustān and pitched his camp in the vicinity of 'Iwaz (Oudh) and Badāūn.*

Amīr Khusrav says that the Mongols were defeated on 12th Jumāda-us-ṣānī 705 H., not by Kāfūr-i-Hazār-dīnārī, (as Waṣṣaf states), but by Malik Nānak (or Mānak), the *Ākhurbah-i-Maisara* (E. D. III. 72–73; *Khazāin*, Text. 41, l. 7).

'Alī Beg is here styled 'Gūrgān', perhaps because he was related by marriage to the Khān. Baranī says he was a descendant of Chingīz-khān (T. F. 320, l. 10; E. D. III. 198). Budāūnī speaks of Turtāq and 'Alī Beg as "sons of the royal house of Khurāsān." (I. 185, l. 8 ff., Tr. I. 250). He is copying from the T. M. in which they are called بادشاهزادگان خراسان (Text. 73, l. 8).

Gūrgān or Kūrkān, Dr. Erdmann says, means son-in-law or a prince who is allied by marriage with some mighty monarch. It represents the Chinese *Fū-mā* and Tīmūr was called *Fu-mā* by the Chinese, because he had married the daughter of Chun-tī, the last Emperor of the Mongol dynasty. Pavet de Courteille states that it is used for a prince, who has married a daughter of the family of Chingīz Khān, a prince of any royal race who has married the daughter of a king and even for any prince, born of parents who are the children of Khāns, who has married the daughter of a Khāqān. (*Tārīkh-i-Rashīdī*, Tr. Ney Elias and Ross, 278–80 Note. See also *Āīn*, Tr. Blochmann, I. 464 Note.)

So, Naurūz Kargan was so called not because he was the son of Kargan (or Gurgan or Gurgīn), but because he was the son-in-law (Gurgan or Gurgān) of the great Tarmashrin Khān.

III. 54, *l.* 1. *Manār Barmūl......, being at that time near Karāmhatti near Kālūl sent him assistance, both in men and money which was attended with a most fortunate result.*

منار برمال × × × بطرف کرام چتی از حوالی قایل افتاد اورا
بمال و رجال مدد کرده بخدمت پیره بندی رسانید و آن خدمت
موقعی مشکور یافت

Lith. 531, l. 12 from foot.

'Manār *Barmāl*, who happened to be at *Karāmchetty*, within the boundaries of *Qāil*, assisted him with fighting men, as well as money and sent them to Pīra Bandī and this opportune help was [highly] acceptable [or acknowledged with gratitude, praised, rewarded with thanks"].

It will be seen that both the place-names are spelt very differently in the lithograph. There can be little doubt that 'Barmūl' or 'Barmāl' is really meant for 'Perumāl', the hereditary title of the Rājās of Kerala or Malabār.

III. 69, *l.* **19.** *The Sultan* ['*Alāu-d-dīn Khaljī*] *determined upon adding to and completing the Masjid-i-Jāmi' of Shamsu-d-dīn.*

The last two words are not to be found in the 'Alīgarh Text. The mosque is described there only as the مسجد جامع حضرت (p. 25, l. 5) and the name of Iltutmish is conspicuous by its absence in Prof. Habīb's translation also (p. 5). Amīr Khusrav preserves a discreet silence about the name of the founder of the mosque as well as of the great minār and his authority cannot be invoked by either party in this controversy.

III. 95, *l.* **4.** *Thus many of the inroads of the Mughals in the time of 'Alāu-d-dīn are not noticed.. ...Firishta notices them, and blames our author for his withholding the truth.*

Nothing can be further from the truth or more unfounded than this charge. The inroads mentioned by Firishta himself are those of Dawā Khān in 697 H. (I. 102), Chaldī or Saldī (I. 103, l. 9 from foot), Qutlugh Khwāja (*Ibid.* l. 6 from foot), Ṭarghī (I. 111, l. 5 from foot), 'Alī Beg and Tartak Khwāja (I. 114. l. 5 from foot), Gang or Kanak (Kabak I. 115, l. 2 from foot) and Iqbālmand (I. 116, l. 9). Every one of these incursions is noticed by Baranī and fairly full accounts of them all will be found in the T. F. Text, 250, l. 9, 253, *l.* 9 from foot; 254, l. 13, 300, l. 8 from foot; 320, l. 9, 321, l. 4, 321, l. 12, 322, l. 7 and even in Dowson's own translation at pp. 162, 165, 166, 189, 198 and 199 of the third volume.

The fact of the matter is that Baranī's account of the Mughal invasions in 'Alāu-d-dīn's reign is, in almost every respect, more complete or exhaustive and also more detailed, than that of Firishta, and if there is any omission, it is chargeable to the later compiler It may also be stated that three subsequent forays which are recorded by Baranī, during the reigns of Ghīyāṣu-d-dīn and Fīrūz Tughlaq (T. F. 450, l. 9 ff.; 601, l. 7, E. D. III. 234, 267–8) are left out altogether by Firishta.

The only Mongol invasion which is left out by Baranī is that of Tarmashrīn, but it relates to the reign of Muḥammad Tughlaq, not to

that of ʿAlāu-d-dīn. The omission is, most probably, due to inadvertance and not to any desire to glaze over or ʿwithhold the truth', as regards the misfortunes and calamities of the reign of Muḥammad or his folly and guilt.

III. 98, *l*. 4. *The affairs of the country had fallen into confusion...through the mildness and humility of Sultān Nāṣiru-d-dīn.*

از واسطهٔ حلم و بی مایگی سلطان ناصرالدین

T. F. 26, l. 2.

ʿMildness and incapacity' would be better. Elsewhere, Baranī deplores the بی قوتی و بی استعدادی (T. F. 56, l. 4). "Powerlessness (impotence, feebleness, weakness) and inefficiency" of Sulṭān Nāṣiru-d-dīn, and the English equivalent employed by Dowson is ʿincapacity' (p. 104 of this volume). بی مایگی literally signifies ʿwant of substance', *i. e.* lack of energy or moral backbone and the general sense is ʿincompetence, inaptitude, spinelessness'.

III. 101, *l*. 15. *Malik Kīrān ʿAlā.*

Read Qīrān-i-ʿAlāī, as in the B. I. Text (40, l. 5 from foot). He is so called, to distinguish him. Baranī states elsewhere that he was ʿAlāu-d-dīn's *Amīr-i-Shikār* or Chief Huntsman. (T. F. 242, l. 8).

III. 101, *l*. 7 from foot. *And that they [the barīds] might discharge their duties with efficiency and honesty, he did not give them too large a field of observation.*

و تا شخصی را براستی و امانت نشناختی بریدی مواضع بزرگ ندادی

T. F. 45, l. 2.

"And until he was convinced of the truthfulness and integrity of a man, he did not give him the appointment of a *Barīd* [Reporter] in any of the principal [lit. big, great] towns or districts. (lit. places)".

III. 102, *l*. 8. *The intimate friends of the Sultān, such as ʿĀdil Khān, Tabar Khān and others of the old Shamsī slaves......often said to him.*

Tamar (تمر) Khān, not Tabar Khān as in the B. I. Text, 50, l. 8. He is styled ʿTamar Khān' by Dowson himself on pp. 107 and 114 of this volume. He is the Amīr who is styled ʿTamar Khān-i-*Shamsī*' in the list of Balban's grandees (T. F. Text 24, l. 6; See also 65, l. 17, 83, l. 17). ʿTamar Khān' can be easily miswritten or misread ʿTabar Khān'. He is probably identical with Tāju-d-dīn Sanjar, whose title is printed as ʿTamar Khān' and also as ʿTabar Khān' in the B. I. Text

of the Ṭ. N. 227, l. 6; 259, l. 3 from foot but is read as تیز خان *Tez* Khān by Raverty (Tr. 714, 758), Minhāj's account shows that he had been a steadfast and faithful adherent of Ulugh Khān during the reign of Sulṭān Nāṣiru-d-dīn Maḥmūd.

III. 103, *l.* 10 from foot. *A thousand horsemen belonging to the palace guard, each one of whom was acquainted with his person, accompanied him.*

But the Text has

یک هزار سوار قدیم حشم نوبتخانی کہ سلطان هریک رابشناختی

T. F. 55, l. 4.

'They were all men whom *he* [the Sulṭān] knew personally and could perfectly trust, as they belonged to the old corps of the *Naubat-khāna* (or Guardhouse in the Palace). It was the Sulṭān who knew them not they him. The Ṭ. A. speaks of them as

مقدار یک هزار سوار کہ سلطان ایشانرا شناختی

B. I. Text, I. 83, l. 6.

III. 104, *l.* 5. *The Sultān built a fort at Gopālgīr and established several posts in the vicinity of the city, which he placed in charge of Afghāns.*

This *may* be Gopālgarh, which is now in Bharatpūr territory and lies about twenty-five miles north-east of Alwār, and the same distance north-west of Mathurā. Constable, Pl. 27 C. b. It was then on the frontier of the Mewātī territory and the erection of a fort or military outpost there for the purpose of curbing their incursions would be easily understandable.

III. 106, *l.* 2. *The mutiny had grown so much and had acquired such strength that the Chiefs of Badāūn and Amroha were in great trouble and were unable to keep order.*

وچنان باقوت شده اند کہ از مقطع بداون و مقطع امروهہ چشم نمیزنند

(Text, 58, l. 8 from foot).

"And they have acquired such strength, that they utterly disregard the authority of the governors of Budāūn and Amroha". For the true meaning of چشم زدن see my S. I. M. H. 261, 288. In the *Mūyyad-al-Fuzlā*, a Persian dictionary written in 925 H., the phrase is explained as ترسیدن (M. F. L. Ms. Rehatsek's Catalogue, II. No. 38).

III. 108, *l.* 1. *Those who were in the prime of life, or were young, on whom an allowance proportionate to their service was settled.*

قسمی کہ کہل و جوان بودند مواجب ایشان باندازۂ استعداد فرمود

T. F. 62 last line.

"Those who were adults [*i. e.* had reached manhood], but were on account of illness or indolence, unfit or unwilling to do military duty, had allowances settled on them in proportion to their merit (or standing)".

Their grants were not resumed forthwith, because the possibility of their return to duty could not be ruled out or excluded. Meanwhile, they were to receive only 'sick pay', the amount of which was to be fixed according to their capacity and the strength of their following (استعداد), but the surplus revenues were to be demanded by and credited to the Exchequer. The grants of the old and totally disabled were formally cancelled and a small pension only given to them. Those of the men of military age who were really ill or malingering were not at once deprived of their holdings, but the lands were taken under state management. The grantees were to receive certain proportions of the revenue and to demand and recover the remainder from the Royal Exchequer at the end of the year.

فرمان داد تا فاضلات حاصل دهہای هر سال از دیوان
طلب نمایند و دهہا از ایشان نکشانند

(T. F. 63, l. 1).

In the third case, that of infants, the *jāgīrs* were confiscated and the entire income resumed by the State and credited to the Treasury. They were to get only subsistence-allowances.

III. 110, *l.* 7 from foot. *The Martyr Prince twice sent messengers to Shīrāz for the express purpose of inviting Shaikh Sa'dī to Multān.*

Sir Wolseley Haig enlarges upon and embellishes this passage thus: "Amīr Khusrav had a deep veneration for Sa'dī, *whom he entertained when he visited India,* and the great poet of Persia repaid his admirer by recommending him warmly to 'Alāu-d-dīn (C. H. I. III. 135. The Italics are mine).

Now Amīr Khusrav was born, as Sir Wolseley himself admits, in 651 H. Sa'dī completed the *Būstān* in 655 H. and the *Gulistān* in 656 H. Most authorities are agreed that he was then on the wrong

side of seventy and that he "took up his permanent abode, interrupted only by some pilgrimages to Mecca", in a little hermitage outside his native town of Shīrāz, where he died in 690 or 691 H. Some of the details relating to the poet's life are variously stated by the *Tazkira* writers, but there is little doubt as to his 'wanderjahre' or period of travel having terminated in or about 653 H. As Amīr Khusrav was only two or three years old at the time, it is impossible for him to have "entertained" the Persian poet "when he visited India". Again, as 'Alāu-d-dīn came to the throne only in 695 H., four years after Sa'dī had been gathered to his fathers, it is a chronological solecism to speak of Sa'dī having "warmly recommended" Khusrav to the Khaljī Sulṭān. (See Ethé's Art. on Persian Literature in the Encycl. Brit. Ninth Edit. XXI–142–3). Sir Wolseley is also in error in asserting that the poet was born at Patiālā in the Punjāb. He was really a native of Patiālī in the Etah district of the United Provinces. Khusrav himself tells us that his birth-place was Muminpūr or Patiālī on the Ganges, in the elegy written by him on the Khān-i-Shahīd, which is cited by Budāūnī (I. 155 = Tr. I. 218; See also Beale, Miftāh, 83, l. 3; Rieu. Catalogue, I. 240 sq. 609 sq.; Ethé. L. Catalogue, Col. 689).

III. 112, *l.* **7.** *At this time, the Mughal horse crossed the Biyāh.*

و اکثر در آن ایام سوار مغل از بیاه بگذشتی و در آمدی و سلطان بلبن خان
شهید را از ملتان × × × نامزد کردی و تا آب بیاه ایشان برفتندی
و شر مغل دفع کردندی و بارها بر ایشان ظفر یافتندی

(T. F. 81, l. 11).

Barani is not referring to any single invasion, but stressing the fact that the raids recurred year after year.

"And in most of these years [lit. times], the Mughal horse *used to* [were accustomed to] cross the Biyāh and make their inroads and Sultān Balban *used to* order the Martyred Prince to go against them from Multān and his troops *used to* march as far as the Biyāh and repel the Mughals," and repeatedly [lit. many times, time after time] obtain victories over them".

The verbs are all in the frequentative tense.

III. 113, *l.* **4.** *That no year passed without the Mughals forcing their way into Hindūstān and* ***seizing upon*** *different towns.*

وهیچ سالی نیست که مغل در هندوستان درنمی آید و تا قصبه اروبرنمی رسد

(82, l. 8 from foot).

"and without penetrating as far as the town of Arūbar [or Rūpar].

The passage shows that the Sutlej was one of the natural boundaries of the empire of Dehlī and served at this time as a barrier that was not always crossed by the invaders. Rūpar is on the Sutlej.

III. 113, *l.* **15.** *The spoil and the elephants which he had captured at Jājnagar, he [Tughril] kept for himself and sent none to Dehli.*

This shows that elephants were not allowed to be retained by any one except the Sulṭān and that Ṭughril's contumacy in regard to this matter was the head and front of his offending and a proof of disloyalty and treason. Baranī afterwards states that when Ṭughril was killed, Balban gave away to BughrāKhān "all the spoils, excepting the elephants and gold which he took with him to Dehlī." (E. D. III. 120). Whenever a great fief-holder or governor of a province presented the elephants which he had acquired by capture or by conquest, he was rewarded with honours. Minhāj tells us that when Malik Saifu-d-dīn Aibak forwarded to Dehlī the elephants he had secured in Bengal, the title of 'Yaghān-tat' was bestowed upon him to mark the Sulṭān's appreciation of his loyalty. (Ṭ. N. 239, l. 8; Raverty, Tr. 732).

So when Tātār Khān, the governor of Bengal, sent from Lakhnautī, sixty-three elephants in the first year of Balban's regime, it was looked upon as the presage of a prosperous reign and made "the occasion of great public rejoicing." (T. F. Text, 53, l. 4 from foot; E. D. III. 103). Elsewhere, Baranī quotes with approval the old Indian saying—'An elephant is not in its proper place except in the stables of a King.'

T. F. 594, l. 10. پیل نزیبد مگر در پیلخانر باد شاهی

See my note on E. D. II. 30, Footnote in S. I. M. H. 139–40.

III. 114, *l.* **6 from foot.** *Next year, the Sultān sent another army under a new commander.*

The name of this commander is given by 'Iṣāmī (*Futūḥ,* p. 160, verse 3129) and the *Tārīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī* (41, l. 5 from foot) as ترمتی Turmatī; F. (I. 80, l. 3) calls him 'Targhī' and this is followed in the C. H. I. (III. 79); but there can be no doubt that 'Turamtī' is right. It is the specific designation of a kind of hawk or falcon and is one of several birdnames which are common among Turks.

سنجر - شنقار - سنقر - بحری - شاهین - بابرن - ترغای - ترغی

are all derived from the names of hawks.

Shams-i-Sirāj (T. F. 317, l. 7) mentions Turmatī and several other varieties of hawks in his account of the *Shakra Khāna* (falcon-house) maintained by Fīrūz Tughlaq. Akbar was also very fond of the sport and kept a large assortment of these birds. Some fifteen of the finest varieties are enumerated in the *Āīn*. One of them is the 'Turmatī', which Dr. Phillott identifies with the red-headed 'merlin falcon'. (*Āīn*, Text, I. 212, l. 6; Biochmann's Trans. Reprint, I. 305 note). Jahāngīr tells us that 'Bēghū', (which was the name of a Seljuq Chief) is the designation of a species of white falcon and it is entered in Zenker's Dictionary as a Turkī word (T. J. Tr. I. 140 and note). Minhāj states that 'Ṭughril' is the name of a bird which is very rarely found or caught even by kings in the chase (T. N. 331, l. 5). Several other beast-names also are in vogue as totems among the Turānian races (F. Kerenkow, in J. R. A. S. 1922, p. 91).

As regards *Turmatī*, 'Iṣāmī reveals a fact which is both new and decisive. He declares that the justificatory explanation given by Balban for ordering Turmatī to be put ignominiously to death was

بباید بگیرند آن سست را ـ کز نامش ترمتی نیامد سزا

ترمتی دلاور بود در شکار ـ چون بشکست آن سست در کارزار

Futūḥ, p. 161, verses 3144–5.

"That poor-spirited fellow should be seized, because he has turned out unworthy of his name, Turmatī. Turmatī is bold in the chase and this man has broken down miserably in the contest." Accordingly, the commanders on the spot were informed that he "should be punished like a coward. His hands and feet should be dyed with henna like a woman's. He must be then executed and his body exposed, head downwards, from the gate of the citadel of Oudh".

The contrast instituted between the prowess (دلاوری) of the 'Turmatī' and the poltroonery of the man who had proved himself unworthy of bearing that name is founded on the fact that the merlin is "a small, strong hawk", distinguished for its fighting qualities and 'dying game', for being, in fact, a 'bantam' in its own class or order.

III. 115, *l*. 10 from foot. *Proceeding into Oude, he ordered a general levy, and two lakhs of men of all classes were enrolled.*

This rendering is liable to be misunderstood and it has been supposed to mean that Balban marched against Ṭughril with an army or fighting force of two hundred thousand men. The number was made

up of all sorts of soldiers, regular and irregular, volunteers and bearers, grooms, servants, traders, shopkeepers and camp-followers.

وچون دراوده رسید عرض عام کردند دولکهه آدمی از سوار و پیاده و
دهانک وکهار وکیوانی وخود اسپه وتبرزن و چاکر و سوداگر و بازاری درقلم
آمد

Text, 86, l. 1.

III. 116, *l.* 2 from foot. *An agreement was made with him [Danūj Rāi of Sunārgānw] that he should guard against the escape of Ṭughril by water.*

وسلطان از دنوج رای سنارگانو عهدنامه بستد که اگر طغرل در بحر و بر
نشیند و راه تری گریزد وخود را در آب اندازد عهدهٔ او باشد

Text, 87, l. 3 from foot.

"And the Sulṭān took from Danūj Rāi of Sunārgānw a written agreement [to the effect that] if Ṭughril tried to sail [lit. sit] in a boat or escape by the water route and throw himself on [the mercy of] the waves, he would undertake the task of dealing with [*i. e.* stopping] him".

The B. I. Text is much fuller, but در بحر و بر نشیند which means 'sea or land' must be an error. The right reading is در بحربر نشیند without the و between بحر and بر.

Elsewhere, Baranī states that Sulṭān Jalālu-d-dīn embarked in a boat at Damhai and proceeded to Karra. دربحربرنشست (231, l. 5). Shams-i-Sirāj also states that Sulṭān Shamsu-d-dīn Ilyās, embarking in boats دربحرسوارشده (137, l. 11), went from Pandua to Sunārgāon (See Text, 198 last line, 199, l. 5, 207, l. 10. Cf. also E. D. III. 304, 321).

The T. M. speaks of this Rājā as Danūh دنوح, and tells a curious story about his interview with Balban. When he was asked to pay his respects in person to the Sulṭān, he demanded that the latter should rise from the throne and receive him standing. The 'pompous parvenu' was very unwilling to do such honour to a Hindu, but a resourceful Amīr pointed out that it was possible to comply with the Rājā's request without any loss or compromise of Imperial dignity. The Sulṭān had only to hold a hawk in his hand while sitting on the throne and get up on pretence of letting it fly just when the Hindu prince entered the hall of audience to make his obeisance. (Text, 42, l. 7).

III. 117, *l.* 1. *The Sultan publicly declared......that he would never give up the pursuit of the rebel. They were playing for half the Kingdom of Dehli.*

But the Text says that they were playing for the *whole*.

من دنبال طغرل رها کردنی نیم ملک دهلی را درکار و باخته ام

(88, l. 1).

"I will never abandon the pursuit of Tughrīl. I have staked the (whole) Kingdom of Dehlī in this affair".

نیم 'I am not' has been misunderstood as *nīm*, 'half'.

III. 120, *l.* **6.** *A canopy and other royal insignia.*

Here, as well as at 123, l. 10, the corresponding words are

چتر و دورباش و امارات بادشاهی

(T. F. 92, l. 12; 110, l. 6 from foot).

The *dūrbāsh* was a double-headed lance or spear which was used by the royal attendants to keep off crowds. A recent writer asserts that it was "a mace which was placed where the Sultān desired, so that no one could cross and go over the Sultān". (Dr. R. P. Tripathi, Muslim Administration, 27 Note).

But this contention is decisively negatived by the words which Baranī puts into the mouth of Malik Fakhru-d-dīn, the old *Kotwāl* of Dehlī. He speaks of himself as

ما که سالها دورباش بر کتف گرفته پیش رکاب بندگان بادشاهان دویده ایم

(T. F. 136, l. 3).

"We, who have for years run before the stirrups of Kings with the *durbāsh on our shoulders*".

The Farhang-i-Anjuman ārāi Nāṣirī describes it as "a two-forked spear (نیزهٔ دوشاخه) ornamented with gold and precious stones, which was carried before Kings," and this is borne out by Amīr Khusrav's description of it in the *Qirānu-s-Sa'dain* (Alīgarh Lith. pp. 78–79).

The *Farhang* states that the word has also the secondary sense of غمزه, 'a sharp *cutting* glance' and cites couplets from Amīr Khusrav and Niẓāmī in illustration of its use in this secondary sense. In the *Mūyyada-l-Fuzlā*, it is described as 'spears نیزها which are borne before emperors and kings', (M. F. L. MS. *s. v.*).

III. 120, *l.* **12.** ***He made his son take an oath that he would secure the country of Bengal and that he would not hold convivial parties nor indulge in wine.***

سوگند داد که پیش از آن اقلیم بنگاله را × در ضبط خود مستقیم کند در هیچ روز مجلس نسازد و شراب نخورد

T. F. 92, l. 8 from foot.

"That before establishing [or consolidating] hit authority over the country of Bangāla, he would not hold a convivial assembly or drink wine.."

Balban was sure that Bughrā Khān could never be brought to give up his dissipated habits altogether. He made him swear to a *temporary suspension*, pending the establishment of his rule, as that was the utmost that he could hope for, from the scapegrace.

III. 130, *l.* **7** *The Sultān's intention was to proceed privately (jarīdah) to the Sarū.*

جریده really means "slightly attended, with a small escort or retinue."

II. 131, *l.* **21**. *Then, coming down, he bent his knees and sat down respectfully before him.*

و خود منحرف شد و بزانوی ادب پیش پدر بنشست

T. F. 143, l. 10.

"And he himself turned aside and sat respectfully on his haunches (lit. knees) before his father."

He did not sit cross-legged as he used to do when sitting on the throne at Court. When a *darbār* is held, the king only sits with his legs crossed مربع نشین on the throne and even the greatest nobles sit on their haunches with their legs bent underneath. So, in a family gathering, none of the sons sits with the legs crossed when the father or some older relative is present. It is a mark of deference which the oriental code of manners demands and the Sulṭān's object was to behave in strict conformity with it. Baranī uses the phrase مربع نشستم on p. 67, l. 8 from foot.

III. 133, *l.* **14.** *Malik Aitamur Kachchan.*

Sir Wolseley Haig takes 'Kachhan' as a "Hindu nickname" and goes so far as to infer, from the solitary instance, that there was "sympathetic intercourse between Muslims and Hindus" (C. H. I. III. 90). But the second name is spelt کجن by 'Iṣāmī (verse 3803) as well as the T. M. (55, l. 5 from foot; 56, l. 6) and Ḥājjī Dabīr (Ẓ. W. 750, l. 7). The Ṭ. A. has کجن (56, l. 1). کجهن and سرخم were, in all probability, the personal names of the fathers of the two Aitamurs and were appended to their own for the sake of distinction.

A Malik named اهجن is mentioned by Baranī (T. F. 183, l. 8), as one of the Turkī nobles who were the confederates of Malik Chhajjū in his revolt against Jalālu-d-dīn Khaljī.

III. 134, *l.* 7. *At the same time, Jalālu-d-dīn......had gone to Bahārpūr .... Here he held a muster and inspection of his forces.*

There was a great plain here and the fire-ordeal of Sīdī Maulā was to be held on this site. 'Iṣāmī speaks of Shāyistakhān having encamped at Bhokal Bhāri (*Futūḥ*, verses 3861, 3928, 3936) and the T. M. following his lead, spells it بهوکل بهاری (57, l. 1). A place called *Bhojla pahārī* still exists and is marked in the 'Map of Dehli as it was in 1857', in Hearn's 'Seven Cities of Dehlī', facing p. 172. It lies about a quarter of a mile north of the 'Kalān Masjid'. 'Bahāpūr' is mentioned as a place about two *Kos* distant from the city of Dehlī in the reign of Ibrāhīm Lodī by Aḥmad Yādgār. (86, l. 1).

III. 134, *l.* 10. *He [Jalālu-d-dīn] came of a race different from that of the Turks, so he had no confidence in them nor would the Turks own him as belonging to the number of their friends.*

As the origin and ethnological filiations of the Khaljīs are a matter of controversy, it may be worth while to invite attention to the following categorical statement of an old Arab author of the tenth Christian Century.

"The Khiljīans are of a Turkish [ترکان] race, who in ancient times settled in this country between Hindoostan and the borders of Sejestan. They resemble the Turks or Tartars in personal appearance and retain the dress and customs of that nation; and all speak the Turkish language". (Oriental Geography of Ibn Haukal, Trans. W. Onseley, p. 207).

III. 134, *l.* 18. *Malik Ahmad Chap deputy, Lord Chamberlain, a personal attendant and councillor of the Sultān.*

که هم نائب امیر حاجب و قرابت نزدیک سلطان بود

184, l. 7.

قرابت نزدیک can only mean that he was 'a near relative of the Sulṭān'. On p. 186, l. 8 of the Text, Baranī again makes Jalālu-d-dīn Khaljī say that Aḥmad's father was a قرابت نزدیک of his own. Firishta declares that Aḥmad was the son of the Sulṭān's sister (I. 89, l. 11), which may indicate that he understood قرابت نزدیک as synonymous with خویش or داماد, which means son-in-law, as well as brother-in-law.

III. 137, *l.* 5. *The Sultān's brother was entitled Yaghrish Khān.*

He is called یغرس خان in the *T. A.* (*B. J. Text*, 118, l. 2) and یغرش خان in the T. M. (56, l. 3, 61, l. 2 from foot; 71, l. 11) نغوش خان

[*recte*, بغرش] occurs also in the Ṭ. N. (B. I. Text, 322, l. 14 and Note) and three of Raverty's MSS favour the form 'Baghrash' and not 'Yaghrash' (Tr. 862 Note).

III. 140, *l.* **8.** *Shall I now, in my old days, for the short life that remains, which has never continued to others and will not be prolonged for me, act against the principles of the law.*

An important word ملک has been inadvertently overlooked and the real meaning misrepresented.

در پیران سال از برای بقاء ملک چندگاه کم نر پس دیگران ماند و نر پس

ما خواهد ماند حکم مسلمانی و احکام شریعت را پشت دهم 185, l. 5.

"Shall I, in my old age, for a few days' prolongation of temporal power (lit. kingdom), which has never remained permanently in the hands of others and will not remain always in ours, act against the law of Islam and the ordinances of the Faith?',

III. 144, *l.* **15 from foot.** *On the ground in front of his door, he [Sīdī Maulā] built a magnificent Khānkāh.*

در پیش صحرای دروازهٔ خود خانقاهی بس با بوش عمارت کرده بود

T. F. 208, l. 6 from foot.

Here we have another example of the confusion between خود and جود. The *Khānqāh* was not 'before his *own* [خود] door', but in front of the plain of the Gate of جود. For *Jūd* Plain or Esplanade—*q. v.* my notes on E. D. II. 237. l. 10 and II. 357, l. 10 from foot, S. I. M. H. 185 and 229. The صحراء جودهٔ is mentioned by Baranī (T. F. Text, 246, l. 3 = E. D. III. 160) and the صحرای دروازهٔ جود by Firishta (I. 101; l. 6 from foot) and Ṭ. A. (B. I. Text, I. 139, l. 2), as the place where 'Alāu-d-dīn encamped when he marched into Dehlī after the assasination of his uncle.

III. 148, *l.* **4 from foot.** *He asked for some delay in the payment of the tribute for his territories.*

از طلب فواضل اقطاع کرده و اقطاع اوده فرصت طلبید

T. F. 220, l. 5 from f ot.

Every *Muqṭi'a* or Feofee was bound to render an account of the revenue actually realised from the district assigned to him and if it exceeded the amount allowed to him for the maintenance of his army, he was bound to return and pay the *surplus* into the Exchequer. What 'Alāu-d-dīn asked for was delay in the demand from the *Dīwān-i-*

Vizārat for the reimbursement of this *surplus*. The word فواضل is again mistranslated as 'revenues' on l. 4 and l. 22 of p. 149 of Dowson's extracts. (Text, 221, l. 1 and 222, l. 3).

III. 149, *l.* 4 from foot. *'Alāu-d-dīn marched to Elichpūr and thence to Ghātī lājaura.*

The date on which he started is said by Amīr Khusrav to have been Saturday, 19th Rabī' II, 695 H. and he is stated to have returned to Karra on 28th Rajab of the same year. (*Khazāinu-l-Futūḥ*, Text, p. 9, l. 13). It was thus only a hurricane raid of less than a hundred days. Calculation shows that 19th Rabī' II, 695 H. was Saturday, 25th February, 1296 A. C., 28th Rajab 695 H. was Friday, 1st June 1296 (Indian Ephemeris).

III. 151, *l.* 14. *His territories also should be increased and he should be carried in honour to Dehli.*

و در اقطاعات او اقطاعی دیگر مزید گرداند خواهد او را برابر خود
در شهر برد خواهد او را بمراجعت کره اجازت فرماید

T. F. 225, l. 4.

"Another fief may be added to those he already holds and he may be either carried in the train of the Sulṭān to Dehlī or permitted to return to Karra as His Majesty thinks fit. (lit. wishes or desires)". Aḥmad's opinion was that the essential thing was to take away from him the elephants and the treasure. Once the sinews of sedition were cut and the fangs of the snake drawn, it was immaterial how 'Alau-d-dīn himself was treated. He left that to the option of the Emperor. If he took a severe view of the delinquent's contumacious behaviour, he might be taken to Dehlī and kept there under arrest or surveillance so long and in such manner as the sovereign pleased. If the Sulṭān was inclined to be lenient and absolve him of treasonable intentions, he might be given permission to return to his fief of Karra at once.

There is nothing corresponding to "in honour" in the text. برابر خود means 'along with himself'.

III. 155, *l.* 5. *Although these villains were spared for a short time and 'Alāu-d-dīn for some years, still they were not forgotten and their punishments were only suspended.*

اگرچه آن کافر نعمتان مکابره گر بیشتری را اندک‌تر و سلطان علاءالدین را
چند سالی بیشتر بر استدراج و مکر مهلتی دادند فاما مهل نگذاشتند

T. F. 236, l. 5 from foot.

"Although most of these truculent and ungrateful men, for a more or less short period aud Sultān 'Alāuddīn personally, for several years more, were given respite (from punishment) by the *istidrāj* and shrewd strategy (مکر) of Providence, they were not let off [or left unpunished in the end]."

Istidrāj literally means "letting fall, allowing to fall or sink by degrees" [درجہ]; but it has, in Muslim theology, a technical or special signification, which is thus explained and illustrated by Hughes, "The word occurs in the Qurān for an unbeliever being brought by degrees to hell and destruction (*Sūra* vii. 181). 'They who say our signs are lies, We (God) will bring them down step by step from whence they know not (*Sūra* lxviii, 44). "We [God] will surely bring them down step by step from whence they do not know and will let them have their way; for my (God's) device is sure" (Dictionary of Islam, *s. v.*).

The meaning is that in cases of inordinate wickedness, Providence gives the evil-doer a long rope and even leads him further and further into temptation and lets him sink deeper and deeper into the slough of sin, with a view to inflicting condign punishment in its own time.

Abū-l-Fazl, who was deeply versed in Muslim theology, descants upon the doctrine thus. "It is a rule of the organisers of fate to draw up some evil-doers so that they may have the heavier fall and be broken to pieces, they let the black-hearted man blaze forth for some days like a fire of straw on the heights of error" (A. N. III. 169, Tr. III. 240).

And Milton also expounds this terrible peculiarity of the method of Divine government thus, in connection with the career of the arch-fiend who is his hero.

the will
And high permission of all-ruling Heaven,
Left him at large to his own dark designs,
That with reiterated crimes, he might
Heap on himself damnation, while he sought
Evil to others, and enraged might see
Infinite goodness, grace and mercy shown,
On man by him seduced, but on himself
Treble confusion, wrath and vengeance poured.

Paradise Lost, I. 211–219.

III. 157, *l.* **7**. ***Although 'Alāu-d-dīn reigned successfully for some years, and all things prospered to his wish......, still he did not escape retribution for the blood of his patron.***

اگر چہ سلطان علاءالدین از روی اضلال دیگران و استدراج برتخت
ماند چند گاهی کارها بحسب هوای او بر آمد

T. F. 237, l. 7.

"Although, for the leading of others into temptation and his own gradual but eternal perdition [استدراج] 'Alāud-d-dīn continued to reign and his affairs prospered etc.

III. 160, *l.* **7**. ***He then transported his army across at the ferries and entered the plain of Jūdh.***

But what the B. I. Text reads is

سلطان علاءالدین با تمامی لشکر خود از گذر کاتهر عبره کرد و در
صحرای جوده فرود آمد

T. F. 246, l. 2.

'Sulṭān 'Alāu-d-dīn crossed over with his entire army at the ford of Kātha and encamped (lit. came down, alighted) in the plain of Jūdh.

'Kātha' is a well-known place on the Jumnā, which lies about 20 miles north of Dehlī and is mentioned in the *Malfūẓāt-i-Taimūrī* and the *Ẓafarnāma*. See my note on E. D. III. 449, l. 10 from foot in S. I. M. H. 355.

The name of the place where 'Alāu-d-dīn crossed is correctly written in the T. A., as گذر کاتهر B. I. Text, 138, l. 1. Dowson has read it as the Hindi 'ghāt', ferry. Major Fuller in his translation of the passage reads it as a name, but he makes it 'Bāghpat' (J. A. S. B. 1869, p. 185).

III. 160, *l.* **17**. ***Malik Kutbuddīn 'Alawī, with the sons of Malik Ahmad Chap Turk, furnished the escort.***

As Baranī repeatedly says that this Aḥmad Chap was a Khaljī and a near relative of the Sulṭān Jalālu-d-dīn and also asserts that the Khaljīs were not Turks, there must be something wrong here. Baranī is not likely to stultify himself by speaking of him as a Turk. What he really states is

و ملک قطب الدین علوی با پسران و ملک احمد چپ ترک خانمان
دادند و برابر ملکهٔ جهان و سلطان رکن الدین در ملتان رفتند

Text 246, l. 11

"And Malik Quṭbu-d-dīn 'Alawī, with his sons and Malik Aḥmad Chap abandoned their homes and accompanied the Malika-i-Jahān and

Sulṭān Ruknu-d-dīn to Multān". See also Ṭ. A. Lith. 68, l. 1; B. I. Text, I. 138, l. 6; F. I. 101, l. 4 from foot.

III. 164, *l.* 9 from foot. *The crafty cruelty which had taken possession of 'Alāu-d-dīn induced him to order [their wives and children to be punished].*

سلطان علاءالدین از فرعنتی کہ درسراورستہ بود فرمان داد

T. F. 253, l. 2.

"The pharaoh-like pridefulness and tyranny which had sprung up in Sulṭān 'Alāu-d-dīn's head led him to issue orders for etc." Baranī is fond of comparing the sanguinary Khaljī with the arrogant and god-less Egyptian. See E. D. III. 169 = T. F. Text, 264, l. 12. On p. 395, l. 8 from foot, he uses the phrase once more and speaks of the

جباری و فرعونی کہ درسر سلطان قطب الدین رستہ بود

Dowson turns it into "the violent, vindictive spirit which possessed him" (III. 217), but this is only a paraphrase.

III. 165, *l.* 1. *Zafar Khān took the fort of Siwistān without resorting to mines (Sābāt), mounds (pāshīb) or redoubts (gargaj).*

Sābāt are covered approaches, roadways or passages from under the shelter of which besieged fortresses can be attacked, not mines. See the note on E. D. III. 146, l. 9 from foot in S. I. M. H. 708 and on E. D. VII. 23. l. 12 in S. I. M. H. 629.

III. 172, *l.* 5 from foot. *A slave of the Sultān, by name Manik, threw himself before his master, and made his own body a shield.*

The slave is called 'Nānak' in Major Fuller's Translation of Baranī's chronicle of 'Alāu-d-dīn's reign (J. A. S. B. 1869, Pt. I. p. 212). He notes the fact that the B. I. Text reads 'Mānik', but states that his own MS had 'Nānak'. Perhaps this is the man who subsequently became known as Malik *Nānak Akhur-bak-i-maisara* and captured the Mughals, 'Alī Beg and Kapak. If he was the person who had saved the Sulṭān's life at the risk of his own, his rise to greatness was not underserved and becomes easily understandable.

But Budāūnī states incidentally that the original name of Kāfūr-i-Hazār Dīnārī was Mānik ! (I. 85, l. 5 ff. = Tr. 251). Could his rise have been due, in the first instance to this service ?

III. 177, *l.* 12. *He then entered the gate of Bhandar Kāl and a struggle ensued between him and the shoemakers and between him and Hājī Maulā.*

و درمیان موزه دوزان و میان او و میان حاجی مولا در افتاد شد

T. F. 281, l. 8.

"And in the *Mūzah-dūzān* (Shoemaker's Bazar) a fight took place between him [Malik Ḥamīdu-d-dīn] and Ḥājjī Maulā."

Here again, the و between موزه دوزان and میان is a copyist's interpolation (Compare Ṭ. A. Lith. 74, l. 14; F. I. 108, l. 4).

III. 180, *l.* **6**. *He prohibited wine-drinking and wine-selling, as also the use of beer and intoxicating drugs.*

The words used are بگنی and بنگ (Bhang. *Cannabis Indica*). It has been asserted in a recent publication (Some Aspects of Muslim Administration, p. 259 n.) on the authority of H. H. Wilson (Glossary of Judicial and Revenue Terms, p. 45), that *Bagnī* is "a Carnatic word for a species of palm from which *tārī* (toddy) is extracted." But the word occurs also in the Travels of Friar Ocdoric of Pordenone (*C.* 1321) and Professor Peliot has shown that it is really a Turkī vocable and means "beers made from millets or rather all fermented drinks other than those made from the grape and distilled spirits. From Central Asia, where the word was used for such drinks, it appears to have come into the Irānian languages" (Toung Pao for July 1914, pp. 456 *apud* Yule, Cathay. Edit. Cordier, IV. 267 note).

The phonetic resemblance between the South Indian vocable and the 'Bagnī' of Baranī appears to be fortuitous and may be safely dismissed. 'Sound philology knows', as a great scholar has wisely said, 'nothing of sound'.

III. 182, *l.* **13**. *The first [regulation] was that all cultivation, whether on a small or large scale, was to be carried on by measurement at a certain rate for every biswa.*

اول آنکه آنچه زراعت میکنند از قلیل و کثیر بحکم مساحت و وفاء بسوه بکنند

Text 287, l. 8 from foot.

This phrase وفاء بسوه is a difficult one and Mr. Moreland renders the sentence as follows :

The first (regulation)—that those who cultivate, whether small or great, shall cultivate according to the rule of measurement and the biswa-yield." (Agrarian System of Moslem India, p. 224).

He thinks that it "is merely a repetition or duplication of what precedes it, 'reliance on the unit of area', *biswa* denoting the smaller unit 1/20th of the *bīgha*. Passages in the next two chronicles, however, indicate that the word 'wafā' had acquired the technical meaning

of 'yield of crops' and this is probably the meaning here; '*biswa*-yield' would then indicate the standard outturn per unit of area, which was a necessary *datum* for the method of measurement" (*Ibid.* 226).

Major Fuller was puzzled by the phrase and left it untranslated; but Blochmann, in his notes, rendered it, "full value of the produce per *biswah*." (J. A. S. B. 1870, Pt. i. pp. 7-8).

Baranī uses the phrase again on p. 288, l. 10 and 299, l. 3 from foot, but neither of these passages throws any light on the meaning. The author of the *Tārīkh-i-Mubārakshāhī* says that Muḥammad Tughlaq's officers کشتها مي پيمودند و وفايا مي گرفتند (102, l. 2), which is almost equally vague and obscure. But there is a passage in the *Futūḥu-s-salāṭīn* which is more helpful and it may be pertinent to invite attention to it. 'Iṣāmī tells us that Malik Sharaf Qāīnī, the *Nāib-i-Wazīr* of 'Alāu-d-dīn, when on a tour, surveyed and measured a field belonging to an upright and virtuous physician and was astonished by the abundance of the crop. Every stalk had a hundred ears of corn and every grain was larger than any one could expect. He sent for the owner, told him that he had never seen such a bumper outturn and asked him to explain why it was so.

شنيدم همان قايني هوشيار + كه بوداست بسنباس آن روزگار
بكشتش مسافت كنان دررسيد + وفاي در آن كشت كامل بديد
زهر شاخ صد خوشه زد سربرون + زهر دانه گشت مقصد فزون
عجب كرد از آن كشت كامل وفا + بخواند آنگهي صاحب كشت را
بپرسيد ازوى كه اي بخت مند + بكشتت چه اقبال ساير فگند

....

كه در هيچ وقتي بروي زمين + نديدست مردي وفاي چنين

Text, p. 303, verses 5820-6.

Here وفا can have only one meaning, which is, 'produce or outturn' and وفاي كامل signifies 'a bumper crop, a sixteen-anna harvest'.

The real meaning and the fact which Baranī wants to stress is that the land revenue was exacted with the utmost severity and not a yard of cultivated land was excused or allowed to escape payment on its produce. Whereas, in former times, extensive areas of land were assessed only in a rough and ready way and every field paid a lump sum which was fixed, or rather, arrived at by mere guess-work. Now every field, large or small, was measured most strictly and not only had every *bīghā* to pay in full as per produce, but not a fraction of the

bīgha, not even its twentieth part or *biswa* was dropped or neglected in calculating the amount due and every one had to pay for the very last *biswa*, to pay for every jot and tittle of the produce, to pay in full and "to the last farthing."

III. 183, *l.* 16 from foot. *Men looked upon revenue officers as some thing worse than fever.*

و عمل و تصرف و عهده داری مردمان را از تپ دشمن تر شده بود

T. F. 289, l. 6.

"And the official position of revenue collector, accountant or manager had become to men an enemy [or curse] worse than fever." تصرف here means the post or office of a متصرف.

III. 185, *l.* 8. *Thou hast an ambition to conquer other lands, but thou hast hundreds of leagues of country under thy rule where proper obedience is not paid to thy authority*

صد کروهي اقليم من فرمان برداري من چنانچه حق فرمان برداري
کردن است نميکنند - من اقاليم هاي ديگر راچگونه در فرمان برداري
خود در خواهم آورد

T. F. 291, l. 13.

"But at a distance of [only] a hundred *Kos* from my capital, there are those who do not carry out my orders as it is the duty of subjects to do. Why desire to subject more distant countries? The phrase صد کروهي is used again by Baranī in this sense in l. 1, p. 305.

ضابطه پنجم - خراج ميان دواب و ولايت صد کروهي بر نهجي کنند
که رعايا نتوانند که ده من غله ذخيره کنند -

III. 186, *l.* 3. *I now hear that alienations of the revenue and bribery have diminished.*

ميشنوم که دههاي و رشوتها درين وقت کمتر شده است

T. F. 292, l. 11 from foot.

The B. I. Text reads دههاي and Dowson says that the literal meaning is 'villages' and then paraphrases it as 'alienations of the revenue (of villages)', but this is a farfetched and arbitrary interpretation and I suggest that the right reading is دزديهاي 'thefts, embezzlements'.

دزدي is used in two other places on this page. In l. 3 'Alāu-d-dīn speaks of the دزدي و اصابت ورشوت کارکنان and in l. 9 from foot he says that although revenue-officers are adequately paid, some of them still steal and purloin the income of the State.

اگر بان هم دزدي کنند و اصل مال کم کنند

III. 186 last line. *If your Majesty will follow the example of the most enlightened Khalīfās.*

The phrase used is خلفاء راشدین (293, l. 3 from foot). It is used only for the first four Khalīfās, *viz.* Abu Bakr, 'Umar, 'Uṣmān and 'Alī. They have come to acquire a sacrosanct character and to be regarded in the Muslim world as supermen who led ideal lives, both as great rulers and private individuals.

III. 188, *l.* 10. *My liege, whether you send me, your wretched servant, to prison, or*

گر بادشاه جهان خواه من گدارا زنده بدارد

T. F. 295, l. 9.

"Whether the Lord of the World keeps a beggarly creature like me alive (or orders me to be cut in two)."

Dowson seems to have read بزندان بدارد

III. 193, *l.* 3. *Malik Kabūl Ulugh Khān......was appointed controller of the markets.*

The right reading is الغخاني Ulughkhānī, as in the Text 305, l. 6 from foot. Malik Qabūl was so called because he had been a favourite slave or servant of the Sulṭān's brother, Ulugh Khān, whose death has been recorded on p. 188. This very high title was not revived during the reign of 'Alāu-d-dīn or his son Mubārak and it was bestowed subsequently by the first Tughlaq on his eldest son and heir-apparent. Ḥājjī Dabīr, the author of the *Ẓafar-l-Wālih*, was called Ulughkhānī, because he was the *Dabīr* or Secretary of Muḥammad Ulugh Khān, a Ḥabshī noble of Gujarāt. (Ẓ. W. I. Introd. vii).

III. 193, *l.* 10 from foot. *Grain was also consigned to the caravans from New City.*

و در شهر نو از انبارهاي سلطاني غله بكاروانيان تسليم ميكردند

T. F. 306, l. 9.

"And from the Sulṭān's granaries in the New City, [*Jhāīn*], corn was delivered [handed over] to the caravans [for transmission to other places where there was a scarcity.]".

Here 'New City' has been supposed by Mr. Moreland to refer to Sīrī, and the environs of Dehlī (A. S. M. I. 37–8); but Sīrī was never called or known as شهر نو and that designation was reserved for the new town founded near Jhāīn by 'Alāu-d-dīn.

III. 197, *l.* 14. ***After the prices of goods and provisions were brought down, the pay of the soldier was fixed at the rate of 234 tankas and the man of two horses at seventy-eight tankas more.***

و ازپس آنکه نرخهاي اسباب ارزاني گرفت حشم مرتب بدويست
سي چهار تنکه و دو اسپه بهفتاد و هشت تنکه بسيار شد و مستقيم گشت

T. F. 319, l. 7 from foot.

As this is a difficult sentence and a friendly critic has challenged me to give a satisfactory explanation of بسيار شد it may be permissible to give my translation.

"After the prices of materials had gone down, the army of *Murattabs* (fully-equipped trooper with a relay) paid at the rate of 234 *tankas* and '*doaspas* [the follower or groom who led the second, spare or relay horse] became large." *i. e.* no difficulty was experienced in getting a large number of 'Murattabs' and 'Doaspas' to accept service in the army on these conditions of pay and continue to serve permanently.

That this is the real meaning of this knotty passage is shown by what Baranī states in his final remarks on the ten most amazing characteristics of 'Alāu-d-dīn's regime. The fourth of them is thus stated.

چهارم شگفت که درعصر او معاينه شد استقامت حشم بسيار بمواجب
اندک بوده است و آنچنان بسياري حشم و استقامت حشم × × ×
نه درهيچ عهدي بوده است و نه در تاريخي مسطور است و نه کسي
را ياد است

T. F. 340, l. 4.

"The fourth wonder observed in his reign was the permanent maintenance of a large army on very low pay and such a numerous army and such permanent maintenance of troops has not existed at any period or been recorded in any history or within the memory of man."

III. 200, *l.* 7 from foot. ***He [Kāfūr]......took Rāmdeo's treasures as well as seventeen elephants.***

The number is swelled, by some inexplicable error, to 'seven hundred', in the C. H. I. III. 113. 'Alāu-d-dīn had been able to obtain only thirty elephants from Rāmadeva after his first foray (E. D. III. 150) and the seventeen which were now taken constituted the 'rump' or last remnant of his elephant-stables. The Ṭ. A. also (Lith. 81, l. 15; B. I. Text.) gives the number seized by Kāfūr as seventeen.

III. 204, *l*. 3. *He [Malik Kāfūr] destroyed the golden idol temple (butkhāna-i-zarrīn) of M'abār and the golden idols which for ages had been worshipped by the Hindus of that country. The fragments of the golden temple and the broken idols of gold became the rich spoils of the army.*

As this story of a temple built all of gold is such as to put a strain on the reader's credulity, it may be pertinent to remark that three other contemporary writers also depose to the existence of this wonderful shrine.

Amīr Khusrav's description is too long to be quoted in full, but the following excerpts from Prof. Ḥabīb's translation will suffice for the purpose of this note.

"The temple of Brumastpūri", he avers, "was a structure of gold, scratching the eyes of the stars. Its golden foundations went deep into the earth. When the foundations of the golden temple were dug up with the greatest care, the golden bricks rolled down. The yellow gold became red with blood. The foundations of the temple were mines of gold and were all dug up" (*Khazāinu-l-Futūḥ*, Trans. 102–3; Text p. 170).

'Iṣāmī, the author of the *Futūḥu-s-salāṭīn*, who completed his poem about 40 years after Malik Kāfūr's hurricane raid, writes thus :

شنیدم که بتخانهٔ زرشکست - زری گران آمد اورا بدست
وزآنپس بگفت آتشی درزنند - زبنیاد دیوارها برکنند

Page 289, verses 5548–9.

"I heard that he broke to pieces the idol-temple of gold and *a boundless quantity of gold* came into his hands. He then ordered it to be set fire to and its walls to be dug up from its foundations."

In another passage, he deliberately lays stress on the fact that it stood in a class of its own as regards structural materials. It was not like other building at all as neither earth nor timber nor brick was to be seen anywhere in it.

ززرهای خالص زسرتا بسر - عمارت درو کرده دیوار و در
تمامش تهی از گل و چوب و خشت - بدنیا شده هندوانرا بهشت

Page 285, verses 5482, 5485.

"Walls and doors of pure gold had been built into it from top to bottom and it was entirely devoid of clay or timber or brick. It was the Hindus' paradise on earth."

As the asseverations of Muslim chroniclers are sometimes scoffed at as Oriental hyperbole or even mendacity, it may be as well to cite the testimony of a contemporary European.

Friar Ocdoric of Pordenone who was in India about 1321 A. C. bears witness to the existence of this 'church of pure gold'.

"There is likewise in this Kingdom (of Mobar), a certain wonderful idol which all the provinces of India greatly revere × ×. It is entirely of gold, seated on a throne which is also of gold, and round its neck it wears a collar of gems of immense value. *And the Church of this idol is also of pure gold, roof and walls and pavement.* People come to say their prayers to this idol from great distances." (Yule, Cathay, Edit. Cordier, II. 142.)

III. 204, *l.* 11. *The army reached Dehlī, bringing with it six hundred and twelve elephants, ninety-six thousand mans of gold etc.*

In the Nawalkishore Lithograph of Firishta, the amount of gold is given as only ***ninetysix mans*** (I. 120, l. 7), and this has been accepted and insisted on as the real amount in the C. H. I. (III. 116). But there can be little doubt that this is due to the carelessness of the copyist, who has missed out the word هزار. Two errors of this sort have been already pointed out in these notes. Three other compilers Niẕāmu-d-dīn (Ṭ. A. 83, l. 6; B. I. Text, I. 167, l. 4 from foot), Budāūnī (I. 196 = Tr. I. 265) and Ḥājjī Dabīr (Ẓ. W. 823, l. 4) who have copied the statement from Baranī agree in putting the figure at ***ninetysix thousand***, not ninety-six.

Major Dow in his old translation or paraphrase of Firishta (Edit. of 1803, I. 307 and note) and General Briggs also in a later version (I. 374) have 96000, which proves that the word هزار had not been left out in their manuscripts.

Firishta himself states that 'Alāu-d-dīn, "delighted beyond measure by the prodigious quantity, opened the doors of his treasury and contrary to his wont, gave away ten ***mans*** and five ***mans*** to each of the Amīrs, one ***man*** or half a ***man*** to several of the 'Ulamā, Shaikhs and other deserving persons, and ordered the rest to be melted down and coined into '***Alāī-tankas*** or ***muhrs***." It should be obvious to the meanest intelligence that it would have been impossible for him to have been so lavish in his largesses, if Kāfūr had brought away only 96 ***mans*** of the precious metal.

It is true that the amount is of such astounding magnitude as to stagger belief. It is natural that attempts should have been made to bring the quantity within the limits of credibility and reduce the aggregate to apparently reasonable proportions. Sir Wolseley Haig has adopted one method of doing this, Mr. W. H. Moreland another. The former mutilates and emasculates the figure by cutting off the tail of cyphers and supposing the *man* to be equivalent to 28½ lbs., concedes more or less grudgingly that the total may have been about 2750 lbs. (96 × 28½ = 2736). Mr. Moreland who has taken the trouble of consulting the old Manuscript of Baranī's History in the British Museum (Or. 2039) and found that the figure is given there also as 96090 *mans*, leaves the corpus untouched but seeks to pare down the *man* so as to leave it shorn of its customary dimensions and reduced to a mere shadow of its proper self. He will have it that this *man* was equivalent to only two lbs. ! He contends that the 2 lb. *man* which was in use at Baghdād and Ghaznī and Shīrāz "survived in the treasury, when Moslem rule was definitely established in Dehlī and that returns of treasure were made in terms of it and not of the maund used in commercial transactions." He admits that he has "found no direct evidence of any such survival," but he still prefers putting forward this "alternative" explanation to writing off these reports of booty as fantastic exaggerations."

But this is really to give the case away. If Mr. Moreland failed, after all his far-flung and meticulous research, to come across any evidence in support of his theory, the factitious interpretation which he has advanced can hardly deserve to be accepted as "a reasonable guess" and one must dismiss it as an untenable hypothesis which leaves the problem where it was. Again, Firishta states (Lith. I. 120, l. 7) that the unparalleled haul of the precious metal was equivalent to about *ten Krores of tankas*. Now this equation can be established only if the figure is read as 96000. Dimishqī (E. D. III. 582), as well as Ibn Baṭṭūṭa (Defrémery, III. 382. Seneroot) inform us that the Dehlī *man* was equal to about 25 *Riṭls* or 28 pounds *avoirdupois*. 'Alāu-d-dīn's *tanka* or gold *muhr* turns the scale at about 175 grs. or a *tola*. As there are forty *tolas* in the avoirdupois pound of 7000 (175 × 40) grains, 96000 *mans* would have yielded 10,75,20,000 *tankas*. Ninety-six *mans* of gold could have been coined into only 1,07,520 gold *tankas* (96 × 40 × 28).

Firishta and all the other authorities are agreed in declaring that such an enormous quantity of gold etc. had not been brought to Dehlī

on any former occasion. Now, Firishta also asserts that when 'Alāu-d-dīn personally raided and sacked Deogīr in 695 H. he had carried off along with other precious things, six hundred *mans* of gold and one thousand *mans* of silver (I. 96, l. 15). The two statements are manifestly inconsistent and utterly irreconcilable, if we read 'ninetysix' in the later case.

The point on which we need to fasten our attention is that Kāfūr is said to have rifled the accumulated treasures of several generations of the acquisitive rulers of not one, but two ancient Kingdoms. He is stated to have carried off not only a larger number of golden idols, but to have dismantled and demolished a temple of which the walls and the roof were also of gold. All the writers, Baranī, Khusrav and 'Iṣāmī stress the fact and speak of this بتخانۂ زرّین with great gusto and the Friar Ocdoric's description shows that some such shrine did exist. It seems as if they have done this because they felt themselves called upon, as veracious historians, to justify their assertions about the prodigious quantity of gold. Firishta, impressed in the same way, accounts for it in a different manner and gives an explanation of his own. He says that the night before Kāfūr's march to Dehlī, "a quarrel arose among the brahmans, who had taken refuge in his camp regarding some hidden treasures." The brahmans were seized and on being questioned "discovered the secret. Seven different places were pointed out near the camp. where treasures were concealed." These were then dug up, placed upon elephants and carried away. (Text I. 120, l. 2; Briggs' Tr. I. *loc. cit.*).

III. 206, *l.* 13 from foot. *During the reign of 'Alāu-d-dīn, either through the agency or the beneficent ruling of Providence, there were several remarkable events and matters etc.*

و تجربہ یافتگان را در عصر سلطان علاءالدین خواہ آنرا در باب او
استدراج دانند و خواہ از لطایف قضا و قدر باری تعالی حمل کنند

(339, l. 9).

Here again the word استدراج is used by Baranī. Budāūnī has copied the passage and Ranking has rendered the word 'respite before punishment' (Text, I. 198 = Tr. I. 266); but this is to miss the real point. It would be better to say, "Divine permission to evil doers to triumph and even perform wonders and "work even miracles" for a time."

III. 209, *l.* 5. ***But as the new King [Shihābu-d-dīn 'Umar] was only a boy five or six years old, he was only a puppet in the hands of schemers.***

Most students of Indian History will be surprised to learn that this young Sulṭān was the son of a daughter of Rāmadeva, the Yādava Rājā of Devagiri. 'Iṣāmī explicitly and repeatedly says so (p. 335, verse 6441) and states that his mother's name was جهتیاپالی 'Jhatīāpaly'. (p. 344, verse 6606; p. 365, verse 6953).

This interesting fact was known also to Baranī and he has not failed to record it in his history. Unfortunately, the passage has been so mangled in the *Bibliotheca Indica* text that it has entirely escaped the attention of its readers. He tells us that Kāfūr used to bring the poor child to the *Hazār Sutūn* Palace and seat him on the throne, so that the *amīrs* and other dignitaries might make their obeisances to him. He then sent him, who was the grandson on the daughter's side of Rāmadeva, back to his mother.

آن پسرک را بر مادر او کہ نبسۂ دختری زایدہ بود فرستادی

T. F. 374, l. 4 from foot.

Here زایدہ is a grotesque distortion of رامدیو the real meaning is that "the boy who was the maternal grandson of Rāmadeva used to be sent back to his mother afterwards".

III. 211, *l.* 6. *There was a young Parwārī named Hasan, who had been brought up by the Malik Shādī, the Nāib-hājib...... The Sultān...... gave him the title of Khusrū Khān.*

I have shown in S. I. M. H. vol. I, p. 368 that the name of the tribe to which Khusrav Khān belonged is written بروار or براو by Baranī, Budāūnī and the author of the *Tārīkh-i-Mubārakshāhī*. I may now point out that Amīr Khusrav also spells the name as براو in the *Tughlaqnāma* (Haidarābād Text, verses 2459, 2472) and that 'Iṣāmī calls them براوہ (verses 6919, 6929, 6959, 7186).

Here again, the author of the *Futūhu-s-Salāṭīn* throws new light on a moot point in Indo-Muslim history. He informs us that when Malik Shādī, who was the son-in-law of Sulṭān Ghiyāṣu-d-dīn Tughlaq I, was ordered to go to Gujarāt to restore peace and tranquillity in the province, he besieged a fort, and brought it to the verge of surrender. Some persons, besieged in the castle, then begged for quarter, alleging that they were only musicians who had come there by accident and sought permission to exhibit their skill in singing and dancing. The

permission was given and some Parāvs (پراوان) came out of the castle disguised as women, with musical instruments of all sorts in their hands and weapons concealed about their persons. Having found admission into the Malik's tent on that pretext, they assassinated him. Most of them were afterwards caught and put to death. These *Parāwān* were evidently re-enacting an exploit of the Pāṇḍava hero Arjuna, who is said to have played a similar trick on Kīchaka. It is not easy to visualise Mahārs and Dheḍs displaying such reckless courage and in this manner.

III. 219, *l.* **2.** *Malik 'Ainu-l-Mulk, Tāju-l-Mulk and Yamkhīru-l-Mulk were sent as governor and assistants to Deogīr.*

The text is more specific. It is stated there that *Wizārat* of Deogīr was given to 'Ainu-l-Mulk, the *Ishrāf* to Tāju-l-Mulk and the *Niyābat-i-Wizārat* to Yamkhīru-l-Mulk [*Recte.* Mujīru-l-Mulk or Mujīru-d-dīn Abū Rijā. (T. F. 398, l. 1)]. In other words, 'Ainu-l-Mulk was the Vazīr or Governor, Tāju-l-Mulk, the *Mushrif-i-Dīwān-i-Wizārat*, or Head of the Department of Revenue and Finance and Mujīru-l-Mulk, the *Nāib* or deputy of the Wazīr or Governor.

III. 225, *l.* **8.** *Before he reached Sarsuti, his father, Ghāzī Malik...... sent Muhammad Sartaba with two hundred horse, and he had taken possession of the fort of Sarsūti.*

Two recent writers have suggested that this 'Sartaba' was the name of a fort near Sirsa, of which this Muḥammad was the castellan, but this conjecture is untenable and will not bear examination. No such place exists about twelve miles east of Sirsa and is not shown on any map. The mistake has arisen from the fanciful interpretation of a solitary verse in the recently published *Tughlaqnāma* of Amīr Khusrav. It runs thus :

بقلعہ سرتبہ محمود پردل ۔ نگشت از هیبت شیران شتردل

p. 83, verse 1574.

This has been taken to mean that "*in the fort of Sartaba*, Maḥmūd, the brave, was not daunted by the terror of lions"; but 'Sartaba' is prefixed to the name of Maḥmūd as a personal sobriquet or title and is not the designation of any place or fort. This stands out clearly from two couplets in the *Futūḥu-s-Salāṭīn*. In the account of a Mughal invasion in the first year of Tughlaq I, Sartaba Maḥmūd is said to have been one of the captains in the vanguard.

شنیدم کہ محمود سرتبہ هم - درآن فوج بد با فراوان حشم

p. 396, verse 7552.

"I heard that *Maḥmūd, the Sartaba*, also was in that army [on the Dehlī side] with a large number of troops." And nine lines lower down we read

شنیدم کہ سرتبۂ نامدار - بشد پیشتر با هزاری سوار

p. 397, verse 7561.

"I heard that *the renowned Sartaba* advanced further with a thousand horsemen."

It will be seen that in the second of these couplets, this Maḥmūd is spoken of as '*the renowned* Sartaba' and this fact precludes the possibility of 'Sartaba' being understood as the name of a place.

سرتبہ is really a common noun signifying 'captain, commander of a body of troops.'

Baranī uses تبہ for a body of troops at p. 514, l. 1.

امیران صدۂ دیوگیر بجانب بہروچ با سواران تبہ خود رفتند

Sartyp or *Sartapa* is even now used in the Persian army for an officer corresponding in rank to our colonel (Eastern Persia, Edit. Sir Frederick Goldsmid, I. 77, 78).

III. 226, *l.* 11. *So they turned their backs upon the place.*

وازخامی ونامردی و بی‌بنیادی و بی تجربگی لشکر خصم
را پس پشت گذاشتند

T. F. 416, l. 5.

"So, on account of their stupidity [lit. rawness], want of courage, low breeding and inexperience, they left an unconquered force of the enemy in their rear."

The meaning is that they were such fools and greenhorns that they neglected even the elementary rules of warfare. They should have taken the fort of Sarsūti and made the garrison surrender before proceeding further, with a view to secure their communications in the rear.

III. 230, *l.* 18. *The officers of the Exchequer were not to assess more than one in ten or one in eleven, upon the iktā's, and other land, either by guess or computation etc.*

Mr. W. H. Moreland has said with truth that Dowson's translation of this important passage is very incomplete and he has given a revised and carefully made version of his own. The only comment I have

to make on it is that the phrase ده یازده does not mean "one-tenth *or* one-eleventh", as he takes it. (Agrarian System of Moslem India, 227–229), but one-tenth or ten per cent. In the same way, نیم ده یازده signifies one half of one-tenth *i. e.* five per cent. The ministry was not to make an increase of more than *ten per cent* or one-tenth in the assessment of land revenue. The phrase occurs again in another passage which he renders thus :

"But if *maliks* and *amīrs* expect from their own country and provinces a half-tenth or half-eleventh and the one-tenth or one-fifteenth of the revenue and take perquisites of *iqtā*' holding and governors, no occasion has arisen to forbid this to them" (*Ib.* 229).

فاما اگر ملوک و امرا نیم ده یازده و یک ده پانزده خراج
از ولایت و اقطاعات خود تمتع کنند

Here I take یک ده پانزده to be an error for یک ده یازده. The legitimate perquisite was to be either نیم ده یازده one half of one-tenth *i. e.* five per cent. or یک ده یازده one-tenth or 10 p. c. یک پانزده is wrong, because it means fifty per cent.

Ibn Baṭṭūṭā tells us that there was a universal custom of charging a commission or discount of ten per cent on all gifts or presents in money sanctioned by the Sulṭān. He informs us that this fraction was deducted from the twelve thousand *dīnārs* given to him after his first interview (E. D. III. 580; Defrémery, III. 408) and also from the sixty-seven thousand *dīnārs*, which were ordered to be paid to him for discharging his debts (Gibb, 210; Defrémery, III. 426). He also states that many Qāẕīs were in the habit of taking one-tenth of all estates, when they divided them among the heirs of the deceased (Gibb, 250). He was also informed by the governor of Larry Bandar in Sind that the revenue of his district was sixty *lakhs* of silver *dīnārs* of which he was allowed to take one half of one-tenth (نیم ده یک in the original) for himself (Defrémery, III. 112). He elsewhere observes that the same rule obtained in the district of Sambhal and that the governor 'Azīz Khammār took one-twentieth (نصف العشر *vingtième*) of the revenue, as his own salary (Defrémery, III. 438). Abū-l-Faẕl also tells us that "the commander of every contingent (*tābīn-bashī*) is permitted to keep to himself the twentieth part of the pay of his men, which reimburses him for various expenses" (*Āīn.* Text, I. 196, l. 7 from foot. Trans. I. 265). The chapter in which this statement occurs (Bk. II. xiv) is headed 'On the manner in which salaries are paid'.

III. 235, *l.* 7. *When Ulugh Khān received information of the Sulṭān's hastening towards Tughlikābād, he ordered a temporary erection to be raised at Afghānpūr,...... where the Sulṭān might stay for the night and take rest.*

Ibn Baṭṭūṭa's account of the manner in which Tughlaq Shāh I came by his death seems to have been fairly well-known to at least one other contemporary writer and is related in much the same way by ʿIṣāmī (Futūḥu-s-Salāṭīn, p. 407, verses 7806–24), though the latter says nothing about the 'clumsy device' of the projecting beam. Muḥammad's subsequent career of man-hunts and mass-murders has naturally engendered the suspicion of foul play and the sudden elevation of his supposed instrument and accomplice to the *Wizārat* of the Empire appears to have reinforced and fortified these doubts, but the chief argument which Niẓāmu-d-dīn and his copyists Budāūnī and Firishta urge against Muḥammad centres round the erection of this *Kūshk-i-Khāṣ*. They question the necessity of raising any such building at all and regard it as a damning and unanswerable proof of guilt. But there is little or no weight at all in this argument.

Shihābu-d-dīn Dimishqī (or ʿUmarī) states that whenever Muḥammad Tughlaq went out hunting, "four *wooden houses* of two stories are carried in his train by 200 camels," besides tents and pavilions of all kinds. (E. D. III. 580). The use of such temporary structures on journeys and special occasions was not uncommon and Baranī tells us that a similar *Kūshk-i-Khāṣ* was temporarily erected for the accomodation of Sulṭān Jalālu-d-dīn and his retinue in the plain of Bahārpūr, on the occasion of the proposed fire-ordeal of Sīdī Maulā and his accomplices (Text, 211, l. 8). These wooden houses were employed and known as 'Kūshk', in Central Asia also. We learn from Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, that when he was the guest of the Sulṭān of the Uzbegs at a place called Bish-dāgh, he witnessed the celebration of the *ʿĪd-i-Fitr*. The Sulṭān, he says, marched out into the esplanade outside the city and sat down in "a wooden tower which is called *alcoche* (الكوش) by these people." A tower of the same sort was put up near it for the heir-apparent (Defrémery, II. 403). Indeed, he informs us that a "tower of wood" برج الخشب was erected for Muḥammad Tughlaq himself after the battle with ʿAinu-l-Mulk and that he saw Muḥammad sitting there and ordering the execution of 62 rebels (*Ibid.* III. 354). Humāyūn also had such a movable *Kūshk* or 'palace'. It was "composed of three storeys, which were of cut beams. The master-

carpenters had so joined the pieces together, that whoever looked at them, thought they were of one piece. Whenever they wanted, they could take it to pieces and convey it to any country. And the ladders or steps to the upper storey were so constructed that they could be opened or shut up at pleasure." (*Akbarnāma*, Tr. Beveridge, I. 648—Text, I. 360). Abū-l-Faẓl in his characteristically fulsome vein of adulation represents it as "one of the many wonderful inventions" of that ruler, but we may be sure that it was only some sort of improvement of the old 'movable tower' described by Dimishqī and Ibn Baṭṭūṭa. In the circumstances, there was nothing unusual or nefarious in the fact of the erection or even of that having been done in only three days. These structures were always kept ready for emergencies and set up as quickly as possible. Indeed, the *Tārīkh-i-Mubārakshāhī* attributes its crash to the elephants trampling the ground *when it was still wet* (Text, 96, l. 5 from foot).

III. 236, *l.* 5 from foot *Sat-gānw (Chittāgong).*

It is not Chittāgong, but Sātgāon, an old port about half a *Kos* from Huglī, (at the bifurcation of the Saraswatī channel from the Huglī), which is now utterly decayed. The Portuguese called it Porto Pequeno 'The Little Port' while Chittāgong was their *Porto Grande* 'The Great Port'. Its decay dates from the silting up of the Saraswatī about three centuries ago. (Yule, Hobson Jobson S. V. Satigam; *Āīn*. Tr. Jarrett, II. 125).

III. 238, *l.* 12. *To accomplish this, he invented some oppressive cesses (abwāb) and made stoppages from the land revenues until the backs of the raiyats were broken.*

ودر اعمال اندیشه مذکور سلطان درست ابوابی پیدا آوردند و مالی وضع کردند که کمر رعایا بشکست

T. F. 473, l. 3.

"And assessed (lit. fixed) the revenue [in such a way (or so high)], that the backs of the husbandmen were broken."

وضع کردند does not mean 'stop, or abate or deduct' but instituted, introduced, fixed, etc.

وضع is used very often in this sense by Baranī,

(498, l. 11). در معامله ازدیاد زراعت دیوانی وضع شد

(500, l. 14). وضع اسالیب تصوری

III. 243, *l.* 11 from foot. *And his oppressive exactions drove many persons to kill themselves.*

Not so, they died because they were tortured, because Muḥammad employed ruthlessly and systematically the stick, the pincer and the rack, as well as chains and imprisonment, like his predecessor, 'Alāu-d-dīn. What Baranī says is,

و چندین کسی در مطالبہ از شدت بسیار جان دادند

T. F. 480 last line.

"And several persons gave up the ghost on account of the excessive severity of the mode (or method) of exacting (lit. demanding) the State dues [by means of the whip and the rack].

III. 243, l. 2 from foot. *He then appointed Malik Kabūl, the nāib wazīr, to be ruler over Tilang.*

The name is printed Qabūl قبول in the B. I. Text also (481, l. 7), and Sir Wolseley Haig has allowed himself to be misled by it (C. H. I. III. 149); but the correct form is Maqbūl مقبول. Dowson himself states on p. 245 that when Kanyā Nāik "had gathered strength in the country (Warangal), Malik Maqbūl, the *nāib-wazīr*, fled to Dehlī." See also my note on E. D. III. 256, Foot note. The B. I. Text is, at times, replete with errors and Blochmann has pointed out that there are no less than sixteen errors on p. 327 alone and so many as forty on the following ten pages. (J. A. S. B. 1870, Pt. I. pp. 50-51 Notes).

III. 248, l. 11. *So he feared the weakness of his character and the ferocity of his temper.*

نازکی مزاج سلطان محمد (489, l. 10) really means excessive sensitiveness, excitability, irritability. 'Weakness of character' is incompatible with 'ferocity', and it is besides preposterous to predicate it of such a blood-drenched miscreant like Muḥammad Tughlaq.

III. 248, l. 10 from foot. *They were opposed by Sultān Muḥammad, ... who had been victorious in twenty battles with the Mughals.*

در مقابلہ سلطان محمد کہ سلطان محمد و پدر و عم سلطان محمد
دامنی بر سر لشکران مغلستان و خراسان داده بودند

(T. F. 490, l. 1).

The important words "father and uncle of Sulṭān Muḥammad" have been left out. The twenty battles had been fought, not by Muḥammad Tughlaq, but by his *father and uncles.* Muḥammad was then only in a subordinate position.

III. 249, *l.* 3 from foot. *In the year 744 H. (1343 A. D.), Hājī Sa'īd Sarsarī came to Dehlī, from Egypt.*

As this sobriquet has been distorted by Firishta as هرمزي Hurmuzī (I. 138, l. 3) and by B. as *Miṣrī* (I. 232, l. 9), it may be worth while to state that the T. A. reads it as 'Sarsarī' (Lith. Text, 106, l. 14). 'Sarsar' is said to be the name of a small town about ten miles from Baghdād on the road to Kūfā (Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, Defrémery, IV. 82, 313). Another old Arab traveller speaks of it as situated at about three farsangs' distance from Baghdād on a small river of the same name. (W. Ouseley, Oriental Geography of Ibn Haukal, 1800, p. 68). Ibn Baṭṭūṭa has some queer things to say in connection with the secret history of the three *Khil'ats* which were said, by Ḥājjī Sa'īd, to have been sent by the Egyptian Khalīfa. The fraud was exposed by Ḥājjī Rajab Burqa'ī, who had ascertained during his own travels, that they had been purchased by Sa'īd in the bazars of Cairo and palmed off on the Sulṭān as robes of honour sent by the Khalīfa (Defrémery, I. 361–370).

III. 249, *l.* 10 from foot. *So he and his ministers and advisers came to an understanding with the Khalīfa that was in Egypt, and while the Sultān was at Sargdwārī, he sent despatches to Egypt about many things.*

که سلطان محمد با اعوان و انصار دولت خود بان خلیفه که در مصر است
بیعت کرده و دو سه ماه در سر گرواری عرضداشت بجانب خلیفه
سوار میکرد

T. F. Text, 492, l. 3.

He did not 'come to any understanding with the Khalīfa'. He took voluntarily and without the Khalīfa's knowing anything about it, oaths of fealty to the Fāṭimite and got his adherents and followers to do the same. When he was staying at Sargadwārī, he despatched in two or three months letters and professions of duty (عرضداشت) to the Khalīfa of Egypt.

III. 249, *l.* 17. *Every King who had, or should hereafter reign without such confirmation, had been or would be overpowered.*

But the words in the Text are

که هر بادشاهی که بی منشور خلفاء عباسي بادشاهی کرده است
یا بادشاهی کند متغلب بوده است و متغلب بود

p. 491, l. 1 from foot.

'Has been a usurper or is a usurper', *i. e.* has ruled without the necessary legal authority and must be classed only as a King *de facto* and not as a King *de jure.*

Muḥammad was tormented with doubts about the legality of his status. He appears to have been obsessed by the superstition or delusion that the unintermitted series of calamities which had pursued him had been due to this lack of title or quasi-divine sanction of the Khalīfa.

III. 250, *l.* 9. *The names of those Kings who had not received such confirmation were to be removed from the Khutba, and the Kings were declared to be superseded (Mutaghallab).*

T. F. 493, l. 2. وایشان را متغلب گویانید

"And ordered them to be called [described or denominated] 'Usurpers'. As they did not hold any commission from the *Khalīfa* or God's vicegerent upon this earth, any exercise of authority on their part was unlawful or illegitimate and the rule, not of law, but of Force, coercion or aggression. Khwāfī Khān uses متغلب and تغلب in this sense (II. 708, l. 3 from foot; 775, ll. 10, 14).

III. 250, *l.* 13. *The Sultān directed that a letter acknowledging his subordination to the Khalīfa should be sent by the hands of Hājī Rajab Barkaī.*

This epithet is miswritten as رفیع 'Rafī'' in Firishta (I. 138, l. 7), but برقعی is quite correct and this man also was known to Ibn Baṯṯūṯa, who speaks of Shaikh Rajab as a very devout and pious Ṣūfī, originally belonging to Kirim in Qipchāq, who was sent with a letter addressed to the Khalīfa by Muḥammad Tughlaq (Defrémery, I. 367–370). The Ṯ. A. also has given this *nisba* correctly as برقعی (106, l. 11).

III 250, *l.* 10 from foot. *The officers entrusted with the loans from the public treasury × × appropriated the money to their own uses etc.*

This is not said of the officers who distributed the *taqāvī* (loans or advances), but of the greedy undertakers (promoters, contractors or 'projectors'), who had applied for and accepted them and thoughtlessly shouldered the responsibility of reclaiming the waste lands.

این چنین طایفهٔ حریص بی عاقبت که زمین اکهل را متکفل میشدند

T. F. 498, l. 4 from foot.

Dowson again says, in the last line, that "if the Sultān had returned from his compaign against Thatta, not one of these

superintendents and managers would have remained alive", but this also is stated of the طایفهٔ متکفلان زراعت اکهل (*Ibid.* 499, l. 5) and of متکفلان زراعت و برندگان سوندهار (*Ibid.* 499, l. 8), that is, of the "body of the men who had undertaken the cultivation of the waste lands" and "the undertakers of cultivation and the carriers off of the *Sūndhār*. (Hindī, Sawandhār ?) or loans". Wilson says (Glossary, p. 530) that 'Ukhal' is a Hindī word signifying 'land recently, brought into cultivation.'

III. 252, *l.* 6. *Orders were therefore given to secure it in Dhārāgīr, a strong fort.*

Dhārāgīr or Dhārāgarh was the name of the Citadel of Devagiri or Daulatābād (Vide my S. I. M. H. p. XVIII. Note on E. D. III. 598, l. 13 from foot). It should not be mixed up with Dhār in Mālwa.

III. 256, *l.* 14. *The Sultān × × × then sent Malik Makbūl, nāib-i-Wazīr-i-Mamālik × × × in pursuit of the fugitives.*

Dowson complains in the footnote that "this man is called 'Kabūl' in p. 243 and 'Mukbil' in p. 253." But the error is his own. These three names stand for and belong to three distinct individuals, who must not be mixed up with one another. The name of the person referred to as *nāib-i-wazīr(-i-mamālik)* on p. 243 is printed قبول in the B. I. Text, 481, l. 7; but this is a misleading misprint and the correct form is 'Maqbūl', as given by Dowson himself on pp. 245, 257 and 264. This Maqbūl was, in fact, a converted Telingāna Hindū of good family, whose original name was Kanū or Kattū and who was one of the personal slaves of the Sultān. He is always called Nāib-i-Wazīr *of the Empire* by Baranī (512, ll. 9, 11; 523, l. 8 from foot). He is the Khān-i-Jahān who was prime minister during the first 18 years of the reign of Fīrūz (Shams. Text, 394, l. 10; E. D. III. 367).

Malik Muqbil was not Nāib-i-Wazīr of the whole Kingdom, but only *of Gujarāt.* Baranī denounces and derides him as a most disreputable and universally-despised slave of Aḥmad Ayāz and deplores the fact of the Sultān having given him, in his infatuation for mean and low-born persons, the deputy-governorship of a rich province (500, l. 13; See also 507, l. 4).

Malik Qabūl (Khalīfatī) was also known as Malik Kabīr and he was one of the most highly respected and honorable ministers of Muḥammad and his *Sarjāndār* (Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, Defrémery, III. 222, 230, 231, 266, 416; Baranī, 393, l. 12; 509, l. 2; 515, l. 13: 523, l. 14; E. D.

253, 259, 263, 264). He was one of the vice-gerents left by Muḥammad Tughlaq at Dehlī, when he marched to suppress the revolt of Taghī in Gujarāt. He died during the Sulṭān's absence from his capital in or about 750 H.

III. 258, *l.* 3. *Then they made Makh Afghān, brother of Malik Yak Afghān, one of the foreign amīrs, their leader and placed him on the throne.*

Both these names are written in many disconcertingly divergent ways in the B. I. Text of Baranī and by Niẓāmu-d-dīn Aḥmad, Firishta and others. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa says, 'Sulṭān Nāṣiru-d-dīn (Makh Afghān of this passage) was the *son* of Malik Mal, who had been imprisoned in one of the dungeons of Daulatābād.' The place was so infested by large rats that when he fell ill, these creatures devoured his fingers and his eyes and the poor man died of it (Defrémery, IV. 48; see also *Ibid.* III. 365, 366, 368). The correct forms are most probably, T. M. 'Mal' and 'Makh'. See also Ṭ. A. B. I. Text I.

III. 259, *l.* 8 from foot. *This rebel Taghī is my slave, if I had ...... sent him as a memorial to the King of Eden.*

The word used is یادگار *i. e.* present, gift, keepsake, etc. Shams-i-Sirāj speaks of the یادگارهاي گونا گون "numerous varieties of presents which were exchanged between Sulṭāns Sikandar of Bengal and Fīrūz Tughlaq" (Text 161. ll. 4, 9 = E. D. III. 311). The *T. M.* says 'Sulṭān Nāṣiru-d-dīn Maḥmūd sent back the ambassadors from Turkistān with souvenirs and presents' بایادگار تحف (38, l. 2 from foot).

III. 260, *l.* 2. *I said to myself, what is the use of pointing out to the Sultān the causes of the troubles and disturbances in his country, for it will have no effect on him?*

با خود گفتم یا چه حکمت است که همان چیزي که واسطهٔ خرابي وابتري ملک گشته است در سینهٔ سلطان محمد از براي فراهمي والتیامی ملک و دولت جلوه نمیکند

T. F. Text 517, l. 10.

"What is the design [of providence] in this that the very thing which is the cause of the ruin and destruction of his Kingdom [unduly severe punishment] appears to [lit. shines in] the mind of the Sultān as the best means of restoring tranquility and prosperity in his domains?" I read میکند instead of نمیکند.

III. 261, *l.* 9. *From thence he wrote to the Rāi of Karnāl, imploring assistance in his flight*

و براي مهرب از راي كرنال استظهار نامه اراينډ [آرانيد] و در كرنال رفت

T. F. 519, l. 14.

"And for providing a place to which he could escape, he procured from the Rāi of Karnāl a letter promising protection and went to Karnāl (Girnār)".

استظهار is an ambiguous vocable signifying 'imploring protection' and also 'protecting, placing in safety'. The *Ghiyāṣu-l-Lughāt* says it means not only یاری خواستن but also پشت پناه شدن or قوی پشت شدن.

اراینډ is a mistake for آرانید or آورانید 'caused to be brought'. Baranī uses آورانید again thus چند کروهی سرگدواری آورانید T. F. 489, l. 10 from foot. Cf. also حشم ازولایت هندوستان بیارانم 213, l. 14. They are the causal forms of آوردن. Baranī uses گویانید ـ گیرانید (493, l. 2) گذرانانید (?) etc.

III. 264, *l.* 3. *A commissioner was sent to take charge of Karnāl.*

T. F. 523, l. 8. و در کرنال مهتهٔ از پیش تخت متصرف شد

"And a *Mehta* was placed in charge of affairs in Karnāl (recte. Girnār) on behalf of the Sultān (lit. throne)." Shams-i-Sirāj explains that the ministers of Hindū Kings were called 'Mahtas' (Text, 170, l. 12; E. D. III. 314) and this man must have been a Hindū. See also *Tāju-l-Maāsir* in E. D. II. 231, where Ajdeo is called the *Dīwān* or *Mahtea* of Paramardi, the Rājā of Kālinjar.

III. 270, *l.* 10 from foot. *Besides, this history of Fīroz Shāh, the author often refers to his Manākib-i-Sultān Tughlik and he mentions his intention of writing similar memoirs of the reign of Sultān Muhammad, the son of Fīroz.*

This is not a complete enumeration of Shams's writing. Shams-i-Sirāj refers also to two other works—a History of Sultān Muḥammad, the son of Ghiyāṣu-d-dīn Tughlaq Shāh I (See pp. 274 and 279 of Dowson's extracts. Shams, T. F. Text. 42, l. 12; 92, l. 6; 274, l. 4; 451, last line).

The history of the reign of Muḥammad *bin* Fīrūz was not a mere 'intention' or project, as the phrase used in two earlier references, نوشتہ آید, would imply (Text, 149, l. 1; 273, l. 14). Elsewhere, he explicitly states that it was actually *completed.*

این مورخ در ذکر سلطان محمد بن فیروز نبشتہ [ا]ست

(Text, 428, l. 4 = E. D. III. 371).

Lastly, Shams informs us that he had written a detailed account of the invasion of Tīmūr and the sack and massacre of the people of Delhī (T. F. 185, l. 6 = E. D. III. 317. See also Text, 82, l. 1).

In fact, he appears to have written a complete history of the Tughlaq dynasty from its inauguration in 720 H. to the year 801 H., in which Tīmūr's devastating inroad pulled the props from under what was left of its power and brought about its total extinction fifteen years afterwards.

III. 272, *l.* 14 from foot. *The Rānā's people were helpless.*

I am not sure that Dowson is justified in speaking of this Bhaṭṭī landholder as 'the Rānā', as the name used in the text in *all the passages* on pp. 37, 38, 39 is رانہ مل, which may stand for 'Ranmal'. Shams never speaks of him as 'Rānā'. *Mal* by itself is not and cannot be a Rajput name. It is only a suffix, like *-dās*, *-prasād*, *-nāth*, *-lāl*, *-sharan*, etc. as in Asokmal, Bhārmal, Jaimal, Jītmal, Kalyānmal, Raṇmal, Sāgarmal, Pohoomal, Surajmal, etc.

III. 274, *l.* 21. *He [Sulṭān Muḥammad Tughlaq] used to explain to him with much intelligence, all affairs of State that came up for consideration.*

هرچہ در قسم ملکی پیش سلطان محمد گذشتی سلطان محمد بکنایت
گیاست سلطان فیروز را تعلیم کردی Shams, T. F. 42, l. 5.

The real meaning is not that these high politics were explained or directly taught "with much intelligance" to Fīrūz, but that he was left to acquire an insight into them from hints, allusions, gestures and innuendoes, aided by *his own* sagacity and intelligence. The *Ghiyāṣu-l-Lughāt* defines کنایت as

پوشیدہ سخن گفتن بطوریکہ معنی ان صریح و ظاهر نباشد

"To say things in a veiled manner, so that its meaning may not be plain or evident". Baranī uses it as the antithesis to صریح and as a synonym of رمز و اشارات (T. F. 49, l. 6 from foot). Elsewhere he writes that he has in his History.

منافع و مضار جهانداری [و] جهانداران چہ بصریح و چہ بکنایت و چہ
بعبارت و چہ باشارت و چہ کشادہ و چہ برمز آوردہ (124, l. 6).

"Discoursed on the merits and defects of Kingship and Kings clearly and allusively, in plain terms as well as by hints, openly and also enigmatically."

III. 276, *l.* 3. *This mode of appointment is called authorisation by investiture with the religious garment and is highly honoured among Shaikhs. × × × This, however, is a feeling which can be only allowed to saints, because the burden of royalty is an arduous one.*

واینچنین خرقہ را میان مشایخ خرقۂ تحکم گویند

T. F. 44, l. 2 from foot.

"And the *Khirqa* given in this manner is called the '*Khirqa* of compulsion' among the Shaikhs."

It was held in higher estimation than any other form of investiture, because the office had been accepted by the person so designated only from a sense of duty to the spiritual guide and teacher whom he had promised to obey implicitly and unconditionally.

The conclusion drawn from all this, 'the application to the case' is that as Sulṭān Fīrūz had agreed to occupy the throne under similar compulsion or only from a conscientious sense of duty, his position was like that of one of the *Awliyās* or great saints.

پس این صفت نبا شد مگر اولیای حق تعالی را زیراچہ بار اماممت
جہانداری مشکل باریست

p. 45. l. 5.

"This sort of virtuous behaviour [lit. merit] is not found except among God's own Saints, and the burden of the 'Temporal Imāmate (or Sovereignty) is (as) difficult to bear as that of the Spiritual."

Thus, Fīrūz's regal vestment was reminiscent of the *Khirqa-i-Taḥakkum*, and his election and his status as King was like that of a *Walī* among the great Shaikhs of the Dervish orders. This word تحکم is explained thus in the *Ghiyāṣu-l-Lughāt* and the *Khiyābān* خواہ نخواہ حکم کسي قبول کردن "obeying *nolens volens* the command of any person".

III. 279, *l.* 5. *He [Khwāja-i-Jahān] set up the son of Muhammad Shāh in opposition [to Fīrūz] at Dehli.*

A gold coin of this marionette was first described by Mr. Delmerick in J. A. S. B. 1874, pt. I, p. 97 and unique issues in silver and billon are listed by Mr. Wright in C. M. S. D., p. 154. The exact date of his accession is given in the *Tārīkh-i-Mubārakshāhī* (Text, 120, l. 4) as 3rd Ṣafar, 752 H. If it is correct, it must mean that the news of Muḥammad's death must have reached Dehlī in an incredibly short space of time. Perhaps, 3rd سیوم is a mistake for 30th سیم. It is

hardly possible for the courier to have arrived at the capital and all the preparations for the coronation to have been completed in eleven days.

III. 279, *l*. 11. *When Sultān Muhammad Shāh died, the Chiefs of the Hazāra of Khurāsān who had come to assist him plundered etc.*

امیران هزارهٔ خراسان که درمدد سلطان محمد آمده بودند

T. F. 51, l. 3.

They must be the ***Mongol*** Commanders of *Thousands* or *Ming-bāshīs*, Colonels of regiments. So *Yūzbāshīs* or Captains of 'Hundreds' were styled امیران صده in India. Shams is referring to the brigade of five thousand Mongols who had been sent with Altūn Bahādur. Certain nomad tribes in Afghānistān *are* known as Hazāras, but Shams can scarcely mean that these auxiliaries from Khurāsān were members of a tribe of the same name which had its domicile in Eastern Persia. It is wrong to write the word with a capital. *Hazāra* is not a proper name here, but a common noun. *Hazār* means a 'thousand' and *Hazāra*, a regiment or body of a thousand men, and then a district able to furnish a thousand fighting men. The general name lastly became the proper name of a tribe or tribes. (Dorn, II. 69; Raverty N. A. 280). Baranī speaks of "several *amīrs* (or commanders) of thousands and hundreds' (Centurious)" چند امیرهزاره و امیرصده مغل (T. F. 219, l. 12 = E. D. III. 147) in connection with the invasion of 'Abdu-l-lāh in 691 H. and of "Mughal commanders of thousands and hundreds who were taken prisoners" after the repulse of the inroad of Iqbālmand (E. D. III. 199).

آنچه از امیران هزاره و صده مغل که زنده در دست آمدند

T. F. 322, l. 11.

Elsewhere, he uses almost the very words used by Shams in connection with the reinforcements sent with Altūn Bahādur by Amīr Karghan from Khurāsān.

التون بهادر و امیران هزاره و صده و سوارانی را که برابرایشان بمدد

T. F. 533, l. 6. لشکر سلطان محمد از امیر فرغن آمده بودند

This clinches the question. 'Hazāra' is not used here "as a proper name, but as the Persian translation of the Turkī *Ming*, that is, a body of soldiers, a thousand in number." (Raverty, Notes on Afghanistan, 280. See also T. P. Tr. Introd. 91).

III. 284, *l*. 7. *Accordingly, he started from Dehlī × × × and arrived at Ismā'īl, which is twenty-four Kos distant.*

This place is now in Rohtak district, Punjāb. It is still of some importance and has a branch post-office. It lies about four miles north-west of Sāmpla, which is a station on the North Western Railway, thirty miles west of Dehlī. It is shown in the map accompanying the Rhotak District Gazetter, Ed. of 1910.

III. 287, *l.* 15. *Interview with Shaikh Kutbu-d-dīn-i-Munawwar and Shaikh Naṣīru-d-dīn Maḥmūd at Hānsī.*

This caption is wrong and misleading. The chapter does not relate to Sulṭān Fīrūz's interview *with* the two Shaikhs who are mentioned, but to a meeting *between* the two holy personages themselves. Both of them are stated to have died soon afterwards and the event is recorded here, because it was the last occasion on which they saw and spoke to each other (T. F. 87, l. 2).

III. 287, *l.* 5 from foot. *In those days, Khwāja Fakhr Shādī was accountant-general.*

The word used here, as well as when it again occurs on p. 288, l. 8 is مجموعہ دار (T. F. B. I. Text, p. 91 last line; p. 92, l. 12).

On p. 341 of this volume, the same word is rendered 'muster-master'. The real meaning seems to be 'Chief Collector of the revenue or income of a department'. Elsewhere, Shams states that Khwāja Ḥusāmu-d-dīn Junaidī (the Majmū'ddār) was placed on special duty in connection with the assessment of the land revenue of the Empire (Text, 94, l, 4; 460, l. 2).

III. 288, *l.* 8 from foot. *The revenues of Dehlī during the forty years, which Sultān Fīroz reigned amounted to six krors and seventy-five lacs of tankas.*

Shams explains how this figure was arrived at. Some time after the Sulṭān's arrival in Dehlī and the appointment of Malik Qiwāmu-d-dīn Maqbūl as Wazīr, Khwāja Ḥusāmu-d-dīn Junaidī was appointed "to determine the land-revenue of the Empire".

T. F. 94, l. 4. براي بستن محصول بلاد ممالک

"The Khwāja toured or travelled in all the provinces for six years and the revenue was determined on the basis of observation (or inspection, lit. what was seen)".

مدت شش سال بندگي خواجهٔ خوش خصال در بلاد ممالک گشتہ
برحکم مشاهده محصول بستہ شش کرور و هفتاد و پنج لک تنکہ جمع
T. F. 94, l. 6. مملکت برنظام سلطنت قرارداد

Mr. W. H. Moreland admits that the phrase حکم مشاهده means 'Rule of inspection', but he thinks that the reference is to the persons who inspect or observe the growing crops in order to estimate the yield. He is of opinion that the Government's share was determined by estimation, not actual division, that is, according to the old Hindu method of *Kankūt* (Agrarian System of Moslem India, 232, 275). But the expression is admittedly a technical term, the implications of which were known to the administrators and bureaucrats of the day, but on which no light is forthcoming from any source. One is only too liable to read into such obsolete official locutions meanings which support one's own preconceptions, theories and hypothetical explanations.

III. 291, *l.* 5. ***Khusrū Malik also concealed some more armed men under the floor of the outer gateway.***

و بعضی زره پوش را خسرو ملک بفرمود زیر تختهای در بیرون پنهان ایستاده کرده

T. F. 101, l. 2 from foot.

"And some other men in armour were ordered, by Khusrū Malik to stand secretly behind the *panels* of the outer gate".

تختها cannot mean 'floor' and how could the men concealed underground have known what was passing above?

III. 291, *l.* 13. ***He [Dāwar Malik] made signs that he [the Sultān] should depart quickly.***

سرانگشت شهادت خود بدندان خویش گزید و بچشم بشارت اشارت رسانید یعنی ازاین مقام بتعجیل تمام سبک میباید خاست

T. F. 102, l. 6 from foot.

"He bit his first finger with his teeth and made glances with his eyes to hint that he should leave the house with the greatest celerity."

انگشت شهادت is the forefinger of the right hand which is raised when the Muslim repeats the کلمهٔ شهادت or تشهد at the close of every two *rak'ats*. This is the Muhammadan profession of faith and has been translated thus: "I testify that there is no deity but God, and I testify that Muḥammad is the servant of God and the messenger of God" (Sell, Faith of Islam, 262).

Richardson notes in his dictionary that انگشت بردندان نهادن 'to put the finger on the mouth', is an Eastern manner of expressing surprise or amazement.

The real name of Dāwar Malik is not known. He was so called merely because he was the son-in-law of Sulṭān Muḥammad Tughlaq.

Similarly, Malik Shādī, the son-in-law of Sulṭān Ghiyāṣu-d-dīn Tughlaq, was styled Malik Shādī *Dāwar* (Baranī, T. F. 428, l. 8, 423, l. 2 from foot). Dāwar is used for son-in-law in the *Futūḥu-s-Salāṭīn* (p. 250, verse 4847 and p. 390, verse 7595).

III. 293, *l.* **6.** *Account of the edicts on matters of royalty. Sultān Fīroz Shāh issued twenty-one edicts and thirty-one instructions ('alāmāt) upon matters of royalty.*

T. F. 107, l. 11. اکنون اغاز کرده شود از حال سکهای تاجداران

These twenty-one *Sikkahāī tājdārī* were not 'edicts of royalty', but certain rights, privileges and insignia which were the special prerogatives of the sovereign. Shams himself explains the word thus :

و سکه چه باشد که بغیر پادشاه باجاه عالم پناه برغیری اطلاق نتوان کرد

T. F. 260, l. 8 from foot.

"And what is a *Sikka*? It is some [thing or right] which cannot be associated with anyone who is not an exalted king and sovereign of the universe'. It was in fact a symbol of regality, an emblem of imperial dignity or status.

So, '*Alāmāt*' were not 'instructions', but 'banners, ensigns, flags, standards which were carried along with kettledrums, trumpets and other musical instruments'. Shams says that during the elephant-hunt in Orissa, the soldiers

باعلامت دهول و شهنا و ارغون و نفیری هرهم میان جنگل درآمدند

T. F. 168, l. 6. و بیکبارگی این جمیع علامات نوا ختند

"They all entered the jungle with the banners on the drums, pipes, organs and trumpets and began to play on all the musical instruments at one and the same time."

III. 293, *l.* **15.** *About 70000 men of the Khāns and Maliks having assembled, Fīroz Shāh marched × × to Lakhnautī.*

One Ms. reads هفتاد دهلیز Seventy tents [of the *Khāns* and *Maliks*], instead of هفتاد هزار 'seventy thousand' (men) of the Khāns (T. F. 109, l. 10), but this can hardly be right.

But it appears from p. 295, l. 4 from foot of these extracts that the Sulṭān must have commanded an army consisting of at least 90000 horse on this occasion. He is said to have sent three divisions of thirty thousand each, under Malik Dilān, Malik Ḥisām Nawā and Tātār Khān, into the battle-field (Text 115, l. 2). The number given for the

second invasion of Lakhnautī is 80000 (T. F. 144, l. 12) and for the Thatta invasion 90000 (T. F. 197 = E. D. III. 321).

Elsewhere, Shams states that Fīrūz maintained a standing army or permanent military force of eighty thousand horse, exclusive of the *bandagān*, that is, the household slaves who had received a military training and were enlisted in the army (T. F. 298, l. 9 = E. D. III. 347). هفتاد and هشتاد are often written in manuscripts so indistinctly as to be often mistaken, the one for the other.

III. 296, *l.* 11 from foot. *Forty-eight elephants were taken and three were slain.*

The number is given as 47 only, چہل و هفت in the Text (T. F. 118, l. 1), and this is undoubtedly correct, as Dowson has just said that the Bengal Sulṭān came out with fifty mighty elephants (p. 295, l. 11 from foot). If 'three were slain', the remainder would have been 47, not 48. The error recurs on p. 298, l. 18 of this volume. There also, 47 is the number given in the Text, p. 123, l. 5 from foot.

III. 299, *l.* 6 from foot. *This central apartment under the palace was very dark and the passages were narrow, so that if the attendants did not guide the visitor, he would never be able to find his way out.*

This labyrinth still exists in the underground apartments of the Sulṭān's palace at Ḥiṣṣār, which are still in a good state of preservation (Hissar District Gazetteer, Ed. 1916, p. 245).

III. 303, *l.* 11. *There were eight public mosques and one private mosque.*

The words used in the Text, T. F. 135, l. 8 are

هشت محل مساجد جمع [جمعه] یک مسجد خاص

All Muhammadan mosques, small or large, are 'public'. These 'public' mosques were really what are known as 'Friday' or 'Cathedral Mosques', where Muslims can assemble in *large numbers* to acquire the merit of performing congregational prayers on Fridays.

Jafur Shureef says that as "women are forbidden in the Qorān to go into the public mosques, the great and wealthy have frequently a mosque in their own compound, where females can perform their devotions" (Tr. Herklots, Ed. 1832, p. LXXXVII). This *Masjid-i-Khāṣ* must have been built for the Sulṭān's harem. Shams then gives some other details about these religious foundations which are not without interest.

Two of these places of worship were erected, he states, by the Minister Khān-i-Jahān. One of them faced a gate, the name of which cannot be made out and the other was in front of the gate of Jājnagar. The third mosque was a benefaction of Sulṭān Fīrūz's brother, the Nāib-i-Bārbak, the fourth of Malik Baḥr, the master of his elephants and the fifth of Malik Niẓāmu-l-Mulk (who had married the Sulṭān's sister). A sixth house of Prayer was located in the *Kūshk-i-Shikār* and the seventh in the old town or village of Andabhata (Indarpat or Indraprastha). The situation of the *Masjid-i-Khāṣ* is not indicated. It was probably in the immediate vicinity of his *Kotla* or Palace.

III. 304, *l.* 12. *He [Ẓafar Khān] embarked in a boat and departed by the river and afterwards pursuing the most difficult roads, he, at length, after many hardships, arrived at Thatta, and from thence proceeded to Dehlī.*

Sir Wolseley Haig asserts that he "fled to the coast and embarked on a ship which carried him round Cape Comorin to Tattah, whence he made his way to the Court of Fīrūz" (III. 177). But Shams informs us that when Ẓafar Khān had his first audience with Sulṭān Fīrūz, he had with him a thousand horse-troopers and a large body of infantry.

برابر ظفر خان هزار سوار بود و پیادگان بیشمار

T. F. 141, l. 6.

It is not easy to visualise how he could have circumnavigated the whole coast of the Indian sub-continent 'in a boat', with all these followers and their impediments. The *Tārīkh-i-Mubārakshāhī* wisely says nothing about 'Tatta' and merely states that Ẓafar Khān "came to the court by [دریا] sea or river to or *in tūsāīn* (?) and brought two elephants as an offering.

از راه دریا در توسائین باد و زنجیر فیل خدمتی بدرگاه آمد

T. F. 126, l. 3.

The T. A. (Lith. 115, l. 15) and F. (I. 146, l. 8 from foot) are even more reticent and declare that he came from Sonārgāon with two elephants. 'Tatta' is, most probably, the 'bright idea' of some ignorant copyist who could make nothing of the obscure place-name which he found in the manuscript before his eyes. It is not easy to say what توسائین means. Dr. Hidāyet Ḥosain, the editor of the printed text, has entered it in the index of place-names. It may be understood here for some sort of ship or sailing vessel, but no such word is found in the dictionaries. Can it be a copyist's error for سفاین ?

III. 304, *l.* last line. *One thousand horse and large numbers of footmen were assigned to him (Ẕafar Khān).*

برابر ظفر خان هزار سوار بود و پیادگان بیشمار

T. F. 141, l. 6.

"Ẕafar Khān had [*brought*] *along with him* one thousand horsemen and an innumerable host of footmen." They were not "assigned to him," Dowson himself says (p. 324) that "the Khān-i-A'ẕam Ẕafar Khān" had, under his command, a large force of *Bengālīs*" or as Shams himself puts it

خان اعظم ظفر خان را در تبع او رجالهٔ بنگالہ بسیار و بیشمار بود

T. F. 206, last line.

"The Khān-i-A'ẕam Ẕafar Khān had a great and (almost) innumerable body of *Bengālī* infantry under his banner (or as his followers)".

III. 305, *l.* 16. *When Sultān Shamsu-d-dīn heard of the preparations that were making against him, he was dismayed.*

چون سلطان شمس الدین صاحب کین قوت مهابت شهنشاه طالب
دین دیده از غایت هراس بیقیاس درون جزائر اکدالہ ماندن
خود مصلحت ندید

T. F. 143, l. 5.

"As the malicious Sulṭān Shamsu-d-dīn had felt (lit. seen) the tremendous power of the pious emperor and was extremely terrified of it, he did not think it advisable for himself to remain in the islands of Ikdāla."

III. 307, *l.* 4. *The Sultān inquired what he meant, and asked if anything untoward had happened.*

T. F. 147, l. 6. مگر از ذات ما صفات قبیح بصریح صادر شده

"Has anything manifestly vicious emanated from our royal person" *i. e.* Have I been guilty of any grossly immoral or improper behaviour.

III. 307, *l.* 7. *The Sultān replied that he liked to take a little [wine] now and then.*

Here one of the MSS adds two lines which are of some interest. According to it, the sulṭān told Tātār Khān that he used to get almost every month maddening attacks of hæmorrhoidal pain and he was compelled to take wine, because it allayed the agony of the disease (T. F. 147, Foot note 2).

III. 307, *l.* 9 from foot. *An account of this foundation [of Jaunpūr] was sent to Khwāja Jahān at Dehlī.*

An error for '*Khān-i-Jahān*'. The B. I. Text has given the name correctly (148, l. 3 from foot). Sulṭān Fīrūz had no noble in his service entitled Khwāja Jahān at this time.

III. 309, *l.* 14. *They [Sulṭān Sikandar's ministers] × × said that the people of Bengāl had never been very friendly with the people of the Upper Provinces, because the decrees of fate had so ruled.*

کہ ہرگز فرودستان بر بالادستان بس نیامده اند زیرا کہ حکمت حضرت سبحانی و تاثیر قدرت ربانی برین است

T. F. 153, l. 6 from foot.

"That the people of the Lower Country [Bengal] have never been able to match [lit. strong enough to come up to] those of the Upper Provinces, for such is the Wisdom of the Divine Majesty and the Decree of the Almighty."

The ministers had probably in mind the invasions of Bengal by Iltutmish, Balban and Tughlaq I, and the crushing defeats sustained by the Bengāl rulers. فرودست is used in this sense by Baranī. In speaking of the 'Thugs' who were ordered to be deported to Bengāl, he says that Sulṭān Jalālu-d-dīn Khaljī

فرمود تا در کشتیها سوار کنند و فرودست برند و در سرحد لکهنوتی ایشان را برند

T. F. 189, l. 6 from foot = E. D. III. 141.

III. 310, l. 16. *Sultān Sikandar replied that Sultān Fīroz had been kind to him.*

حضرت سلطان فیروز شاه مخدوم و ولی نعمت و اودر من است

T. F. 157, l. 5 from foot.

"His Majesty Sulṭān Fīrūz Shāh is my master, patron and uncle."

Sikandar was a young man, Fīrūz an old man of about fifty-five who had been contemporary with and was of nearly the same age as his father.

So the *Tārīkh-i-Dāūdī* tells us that Sikandar Lodī once wrote to Sulṭān Ḥusain Sharqī of Jaunpūr in these terms. "You are in the place of my uncle; all that happened between you and Sulṭān Bahlol has passed. I bear no enmity to you, and would treat you with respect" (E. D. IV. 458).

Another chronicler, Abū Turāb Walī, cites a letter addressed by Humāyūn to Sulṭān Maḥmūd Laṭīf of Gujarāt in which the latter is called برادرزاده، and فرزند (*Tārīkh-i-Gujarāt*, Ed. Ross, 43, l. 4 from foot).

III. 311, *l.* 5. *The Sultān [Fīrūz] advanced two marches.*

حضرت فیروز شاه دو منزل از آن جایگاه پستر آمد

T. F. 160, l. 1.

He did not advance, he retreated, as a sign that he was prepared to return to his own country, as peace had been made or at least an armistice had been agreed to. An advance, in such circumstances, would have meant a continuance of hostilities or resumption of the offensive. The word in the B. I. Text is پستر. Dowson has wrongly read بیشتر.

III. 312, last line. *The writer has been told that there were two forts in Banārasī, each populated with a large number of people.*

But the B. I. Text reads the sentence thus:

راویان شریف برین مورخ ضعیف × × گفته‌اند که دور حصار بنارسی سی کروه است در هر یک کروه خلائق آباد انست

T. F. 164, l. 6.

"That the circumference of the fortifications of Banārasī was thirty *Kos*, in every one of which there was a great population." Dowson's MS appears to have read دور حصار instead of دو حصار.

III. 315, *l.* 1. *After explanations, the Rāi sent twenty mighty elephants as an offering.*

The B. I. edition has بیست in the body of the text and بیست و پنج is given only as a variant in the footnote (171, l. 6 from foot), though the latter lection must be the right reading. We are informed, on the very next page, that the total number of elephants brought by the Sulṭān from Bengal and Jājnagar was 73 (E. D. III. 316, l. 14; text. 172, l. 4). This total will come right only if 25 (and not 20) were sent by the Rāi, as Sulṭān Sikandar had sent 40 and 8 were captured alive in the jungle 40 + 8 + 25 = 73.

The later compilers are at variance in regard to the number. The *Tārīkh-i-Mubārakshāhī* says Sulṭān Sikandar sent thirty-seven, the Rāi of Jājnagar thirty-three and two were killed in the jungle, making 70 taken alive (128, l. 1 from foot; 129, l. 3 from foot). The numbers given by the T. A. are 7, 33, 33, (and 2 killed), respectively, which

sum up to 73 (B. I. Text. I. 231–232). But Firishta has, 48 (Sikandar), 37 (Rāi), 33 (captured) and 2 (killed) (I. 147, ll. 14–18), which makes 118. F. must be mistaken. All the four authors quote a *rubā'ī* of a contemporary versifier, in which it is said that the Sulṭān captured alive (زنده گرفت) 33 elephants in Jājnagar and killed 2. These discrepancies are due to the errors and guesses of the compilers. Shams is right in regard to the number 73 brought to Dehlī. The primary bungler was the composer of the *Rubā'ī*. The Sulṭān had obtained 25 from the Rāi of Jājnagar and eight from the elephant-hunt in the jungles of that country. The poetaster lumped the two figures together and represented the total as *taken* or captured (گرفت) in the course of the chase 25 + 8 = 33.

The T. M. gave the credit for thirty-three to the Rāi alone, because they had been all caught *in his kingdom*, and the *Rubā'ī* writer had explicitly said so.

Nīẓāmu-d-dīn allotted thirty-three to the Rāi, because the T. M. had done so and then ascribed another thirty-three to the *hunt* because the *Rubā'ī* had said so. But as he had read somewhere that the total number brought away was seventy-three, he made up that number by putting the remainder (seven) down to Sikandar. Firishta then jumbled it still further. The T. M. had ascribed 37 to Sikandar. He turned them over to the Rāi. The T. A. had allotted seven (or eight) to Sikandar, he inflated them to *forty*-eight and then following the same authority more faithfully or slavishly, averred that thirty-three more had been trapped in the forest.

This is how our "original authorities" have been put together or composed.

III. 316, *l*. 19. *Just at this time, Maulānā Ziāu-d-dīn Barni × × died.*

'Just at this time' is too precise and likely to mislead the reader, anxious to fix exactly the year of Baranī's death. All that is really said by Shams is that he died 'during these days'.

اندر آن ایام کہ خدمت مولانا ضیاء الدین برنی × × × برحمت حق پیوستہ

T. F. 177, l. 1.

The date of Baranī's death is not precisely known.

III. 317, *l*. 11. ***He [Sulṭān Fīrūz] assigned thirty-six lacs of tankas for learned and religious men and about a 100 lacs in pensions and gifts to the poor and needy.***

واز جهت وظائف برای طویل [و] طوائف زمین اکهل موازنه صد
لک تنکه بفقرا و مساکین بینوا داده

T. F. 179, l. 4 from foot.

The B. I. editors give تنکه in the body of the text, but بیگه *as a* variant in the footnote.

There can be little doubt that here again, the variant is right and that Shams wrote بیگه and not تنکه. "To the mendicants and the indigent poor, he assigned one hundred *lacs* of *bīghas* of waste land for their maintenance." The mention of waste land زمین اکہل in close juxtaposition with the doubtful word proves that it is *Bīgha* and not *tanka*.

Moreover, Shams states that the total land-revenue of the empire was about six *Krors* and seventy-five (or eighty-five) *lakhs* of *tankas*. It is not likely that fifteen *per cent* of this amount should have been thrown away on paupers and religious vagabonds. Baranī also speaks of سه لک بیگه زمین اکہل 'three lakhs of *bīghas* of waste land' having been given by Muḥammad Tughlaq for reclamation to certain persons who were also given advances in money for the purpose (T. F. 498, l. 6 from foot).

III. 318, *l.* 4 *The idol, Jwālāmukhī, much worshipped by the infidels was situated in the road to Nagarkot :*

The Ṭ. A. states that the temple contained a library in which thirteen hundred books of the ancient *brahmans* were found and that the Sulṭān ordered some of them to be translated into Persian. Among these was a pseudo-scientific work on auguries and omens which was translated by 'Izzu-d-dīn-i-Khālid Khānī and called by him *Dalāil-i-Fīrūzshāhī*. Niẓāmu-d-dīn adds that he had seen and read that work. It is not now extant, but copies of two other translations from the Sanskrit which were made at this time exist in the India Office Library. One of them is entitled غنیة المنیه *Ghuniyyat-al-Muniyyat.* (Richness of desire). It is a treatise on Hindu music and is said to have been composed in 776 H. by the author at the request of Shamsu-d-dīn Abū Rijā, the Nāib of Gujarat (Ethé. I. O. L. Catalogue, No. 2008, Col. 1116).

Another is a version of the *Brihat Saṁhitā* of Varāhamihira. The translator is styled 'Abdu-l-'Azīz Shams Bahānūrī (بہا نوری) and described as the author of a *Tawārīkh-i-Fīrūzshāhī.* Dr. Ethé hazards the conjecture that he can be no other than Shams-i-Sirāj; but this is not at all probable, as Shams-i-Sirāj does not appear to have possessed even a nodding acquaintance with Sanskrit and was also devoid of the competent knowledge of astronomy, astrology, mathematics, geography

and other sciences, without which it would be impossible even to understand, the monumental work of the great Hindu polymath.

The *Tawārīkh-i-Fīrūzshāhī* referred to must be some other work than that of Sirāj. Can it be the *Sīrat-i-Fīrūzshāhī*, of which there is a unique copy in the Bānkīpūr Library (Muqtadir, Catalogue V)? The book contains a lengthy account, with drawings, diagrams and technical details of the mechanical devices employed in the transport by land and water of the Asoka monoliths. The author, whose name is not stated anywhere in the work, appears to have been an engineer and mathematician. He states that the Sulṭān was himself deeply versed in astronomy and that several improvements were introduced by him in the construction of astrolabes. (Page and Quraishi, Memoir No. 52 Archæological Survey of India, 1937 on Fīrūzshāh's Kotla).

III. 318, *l.* 10 from foot. *Other infidels have said that Sultān Muhammad Shāh bin Tughlik Shāh held an umbrella over this same idol [of Jwālāmuhhī], but this also is a lie.*

'Iṣāmī fulminates against Muḥammad's hinduising proclivities. He writes thus :

زآئین اسلام سرتافتم - ابا زمرهٔ کفر دریافتم
جماعت بجمعه در انداختم - ابا هندوان هولی باختم
ابا جوگیان گشتم خلوت گرا - بدل راه کفار را داده جا

(*Futūḥ* p. 491, Verses 9557 et seq).

"He had turned away from the ways of Islam and joined the community of infidelity, abandoned the congregational prayers on Friday and taken part with Hindūs in the gambols of the *Holī*. He had even sat in secret consultations with *Jogīs* and made room in his heart for the ways of the infidels."

Muḥammad's partiality and admiration for "the enchanters called Jogīs" is borne witness to by Ibn Baṭṭūṭa also. He states that he once found the Sulṭān closeted with two men of this class, who performed some feats of magic or conjuring, which were so extraordinary that he fell sick and suffered from palpitation of the heart for some time afterwards (Defrémery, IV. 38–9; See also *Ibid*. 36; Gibb, Travels of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa in Asia and Africa, p. 226).

Shams summarily dismisses the asseveration as lying Hindu propaganda or a "weak invention of the enemy"; but it may not have been

without some sort of factual foundation. Budāūnī tells us that when Ḥusain Qulī Khān besieged Nagarkot in 980 H. "that golden umbrella, which was erected on the top of the cupola of the temple, was riddled with arrows, many of which may be seen hanging there to this day" (Text, II. 162 = Tr. II. 165).

We know that other renowned Hindu shrines of universally accredited sanctity possessed then and do even now a similar ornament or privilege. The Muslim law, while forbidding the erection of new idol-temples or the repairs or rebuilding of those which have fallen down, also prescribes that no extant or old temple should be damaged or demolished and that none of the religious privileges which the Hindus have been allowed to enjoy from ancient times *e. g.* pilgrimages, baths and fairs in holy places etc. should be interfered with. There could be no doubt that this "golden umbrella" on the cupola of the temple in Nagarkot had been the cynosure of all eyes for centuries. It is possible that Muḥammad, who is known to have established special courts for the meticulous adjudication of the religious law, may have permitted the priests and Jogīs of the shrine to continue to enjoy this time-honoured privilege after the normal surrender of the fort and the formal submission of the Rājā. This trivial concession may have been turned and twisted by the zealots of each party–Hindus and Musalmans–in accordance with their own communal bias and religious prejudices.

The words used by Shams are یک چتر برسر آن بت نهاده (187, l. 10), which mean that "he *placed* (not 'held') an umbrella over the head of that idol". All that he really did was *perhaps* to allow it to remain, where it had been placed generations before his own time.

III. 320, *l.* 7 from foot. *The ministers......made a report of the numbers of horse and foot, who were present and of those who were absent.*

از طائفہ سوار جرار و پیادگان شمشیر گذار از زمرۂ وجهدار و غیر
وجهدار عرض کرده
T. F. 193, l. 10.

The reference is to the two classes in each of the two arms—the cavalry as well as the infantry—to the *Wajhdārs* and *Ghair Wajhdārs*. Dowson himself renders these terms as 'regulars' and 'irregulars'. The real meaning, however, is, those whose stipends were derived from assignments of lands, and those who were paid in cash or otherwise from the State Treasury. See Dowson's own explanation on p. 346 of this volume. It would appear from what Shams says that many of

these غیر وجهدار were volunteers (T. F. 144, l. 3 from foot = E. D. III. 305). The sentence should be translated thus: "They held a muster of the brave horsemen and sword-wielding footmen of both classes—of those who held assignments of land and also of those who were paid in cash or otherwise".

III. 324, *l.* 5 from foot. *If the (salt) water was held upon the tongue, it crystallised.*

اگر آن آبرا در سر زبان بدارند از غایت شور زبان قطره قطره گردد

T. F. 208, l. 11.

"If the salt water was placed on the tip of the tongue, it oozed out drop by drop." The tongue was so irritated by the saline matter, that the water was rejected by it and squeezed or thrown out by it drop by drop. Salt is hygroscopic and absorbs or attracts moisture from the atmosphere.

III. 329, *l.* 2. *And the robes and titles had all been prepared.*

T. F. 225, l. 3. جامہ و مراتب موجود کرده بودند

Here مراتب really means, not 'titles', but "kettle-drums and banners", *q. v.* my note on E. D. III. 305, l. 3 from foot in S. I. M. H. Vol. I, 315.

III 331, *l.* 7. *At that time, mung was five tankas a man, and bread (jarrat) four tankas a man.*

جره must here stand for the Arabic ذرة or *dourra, i. e.* the vernacular *Juār* or *Jār* (*Sorghum vulgare*). Ibn Baṭṭūṭa tells us that the food of the people of Sind consisted of millet (ذرة in the Text and *Sorghum* in the Translation), and pulse (*pois* in French), which they call *mochone* [مشنگ] and with which they eat their bread" (Defrémery, III. 103). This is really the *Hindustānī dālroṭī*. Four *tankas* was the market-price of a *man* of *sorghum*, not of 'bread'. See Yule, H. J. *s. v.* Jowaur.

III. 337, *l.* 12 from foot. *The splendid army of Sultān 'Alāu-d-dīn had marched towards Thatta, but the difficulties of the enterprise had rendered the attempt abortive.*

'Alāu-d-dīn's invasion of Lower Sind is not mentioned by any of the Dehlī historians; though he is said to have attacked and taken away as a prisoner to Dehlī a local tyrant named 'Umar or Hamīr Sūmra. But the account of the Sūmra dynasty is based on legends and traditions which are full of discrepancies and anachronisms and the proximate cause of 'Umar's downfall is besides traced to a violation of the

chastity of a married woman, which is an exceedingly common *motif* of the Nemesis which overtakes the oppressor, in folklore and romance (*Tārīkh-i-Ṭāhirī* in E. D. I. 265). But this popular tale of ʻAlāu-d-dīn's invasion of Lower Sind is totally ignored in the *Tārīkh-i-Sind* of Mīr Maʻṣūm, from which all the later provincial histories have confessedly extracted and borrowed. He states that the last Sūmra ruler Armīl, was defeated and killed by a Samma named Unar and that the invasion of ʻAlāu-d-dīn took place in the reign of his descendant Jām Tamāchī (Text, 61, l. 17; 64, l. 3 = E. D. I. 223, 225). But Maʻṣūm's account also is not without anachronisms and is more or less sophisticated and inconsistent.

III. 338, *l*. 1. *He [the Sulṭān] directed that those who had deserted him in Gujarāt, after receiving his gifts, and had returned home etc.*

The word which is rendered 'gifts' is دهیازده *q. v.* my note on E. D. III. 321, l. 1 in S. I. M. H. Vol. I, 321. They were not 'gifts', but advances made to the army from the state treasury to enable the troopers to re-equip themselves after their disastrous retreat. The sums thus advanced were to be afterwards recovered when their emoluments were paid.

III. 339, *l*. 8 from foot. *One day his [the Sulṭān's] officers came to him and represented that they were desirous of making a march to Daulatābād.*

If the Bibl. Ind. text is correct, the translation given here is nothing but a travesty of the author's meaning. The purport of what is said there is that after the Maʻbār envoys had been dismissed, the Sulṭān himself mooted the question of an expedition to Daulatābād in conversation. He said that conquest and extension of territory was the natural function and duty of Kings, and that the idea of undertaking an invasion of the Dekkan had often occurred to him, but he was anxious to know what Khān Jahān thought about it. When thus appealed to, the Khān stated that war against and conquest of the territories of infidels was perfectly legitimate and that it was not necessary for the Sulṭān to undertake any such expedition in person. Any one of his nobles could be sent in his stead. But if the Sulṭān contemplated the invasion of any country under the rule of Musalmans—and Daulatābād was such a country—he was strongly and decidedly against it, as such territorial aggrandisement at the expense of the faithful was fraught with ten evils for the one good which it appeared to possess. After hearing

a long discourse on the ten evils, the Sulṭān is said to have admitted that the Wazīr was quite right and to have resolved to never invade Muslim territory (T. F. 263, l. 4 ff. 267, l. 9).

III. 341, *l.* 2 from foot. *To such an extent were matters carried that there was a distinct muster-master (majmū'dār) of the slaves, a separate treasury for the payment of their salaries, etc.*

The *Majmū'dār* was not a 'mustermaster' but a collector of the income or revenue of a department. H. H. Wilson explains the word thus: 'a revenue accountant, one who keeps the account of *Jama'* or revenue collections' (Glossary, s. v.). Dowson has confounded here the word with جماعدار *Jamā'dār*. On p. 287, l. 5 from foot of this volume, Dowson himself renders it 'accountant-general'.

III. 350, *l.* 16. *The author has read in the works of good historians that these pillars were the walking sticks of the accursed Bhīm.*

This legendary explanation is still the only one known to the common people in this country and Cunningham tells us that the Asoka Pillar near Basārh in Behār is called *Bhīmsen kā lāt or ḍanḍā* by the inhabitants (Archæological Survey of India Reports, I. 61). Elsewhere, we are informed that the peoples' name for the similar monolith lying near Bhilsā is *Bhīm Lāt* and the Imperial Gazetteer makes exactly the same statement about the Lion-Pillar erected by Asoka at Lauriya Nandangarh in the Bettiah subdivision of Champāran district, which is about 32 feet 9 inches in height and between 35 and 26 inches in diameter. It is also commonly known as Bhīmsingh's *lāth* (XVI. 156). Another pillar of the same type at the old village of Suhania, in Gwālior State, thirty eight miles east of Lashkar, is also called Bhīm Lāt by the people (Luard, Central India Gazetteer, Vol. I, pt. I, pp. 292–3).

III. 352, *l.* 11 from foot. *Some ornamental friezes......were placed round its two capitals (do sar-i-ān).*

But the reading in the B. I. Text is دردور سرآن (312, *l.* 3) *i. e.* "all round its capital", and this must be correct, as there was only one capital.

III. 352, *l.* 4 from foot. *Certain infidel Hindus interpreted them [the inscriptions on the pillars] as stating that no one should be able to remove the obelisk......till there should arise......a king named Sultān Fīrōz etc.*

The *brahmans* concocted this easily provable prophecy *post factum* only to conceal their ignorance and save their own faces. It is a curious coincidence that the Pandits of Kashmīr played a similar trick with one of its sulṭāns about the same time. Abū-l-Faẓl states that when a lofty temple in Pāraspur (Parihāsapura) was destroyed by Sikandar Butshikan (797–819 H.), "a copper-tablet was discovered on which was inscribed in Sanskrit, that after the lapse of eleven hundred years, one Sikandar, would destroy it, and gather for himself exceeding great chastisement" (*Āīn*. Tr. II. 364). The story is told in the Ṭ. A. (Lith. 600, l. 7) and also by Firishta (II. 341, l. 12 = Tr Briggs, IV. 465), who says that the temple had been erected by Alhādat or Laltādat (Lalitāditya). Dr. Sir Aurel Stein informs us that "exactly the same tradition is now current among the *purohits* of Vijābror, about the destruction of the Vijayeshwara temple" (J. A. S. B. 1899, Pt. I. p. 195 note). Cunningham, while alluding to the tale, as it is told by Firishta, remarks that "as the difference of time between this prince (Lalitāditya, who reigned from 723–760 A. C.) and Sikandar is barely 700 years, it is strange that the tradition should preserve a date so much at variance with the chronology of their own native chronicles" (Ancient Geography of India, Ed. 1871, p. 102). But this historical blunder only proves that the men who faked the prophecy were as ignorant as they were dishonest.

III. 354, *l*. 8. *Of cities......there were Tughlikpūr-i-Kāsna, Tughlikpur-i-Mulūk-i-Kamūt and Jaunpūr etc.*

I am informed by a local authority that there is still a village called *Tughalpūr*, about two miles distant from the town of Kāsna in Bulandshahar district. This must be the Tughlaqpūr-i-Kāsna of Shams.

The second name is written تغلق پور دهولكوت 'Tughlaqpūr Dhūlkot' and also تعلق پور ملوک مکوت (T. F. 330, l. 5 and Note). There is a place called Dhūlkot in Gurgāon District, and also in Ludhiāna. A third 'Dhūlkot' lies five miles north of Ambālā Cantonment on the North-Western Railway.

III. 355, *l*. 8 from foot. *If any one expressed a desire to be made the slave (Bandah) of any particular nobleman.*

بندہ signifies 'servant', as well as 'slave', and the former meaning is preferable. No free man would willingly become a slave. All that is meant is that employment was found for the man with the Amīr of his own choice. All the great Mughal *amīrs* spoke of themselves as بندۂ پادشاهي but they were not 'slaves'.

III. 357, *l.* **9 from foot.** *On the striking of the coin called Shashgânî.*

T. F. 344, l. 1. شرح بیان احوال سکهٔ مهر ششگانی

There is nothing corresponding to the word 'striking'. The caption would be better rendered thus :

"Narration of an event [or incident] relating to the coin [denominated] *Muhr-i-Shashgānī* (or stamped coin called *Shashgānī*). The احوال is the story of the debasement of the coin and the manner in which the matter was hushed up without compromising the mine-master.

III. 358, *l.* **14.** *The new coin [the Shashgānī] was accordingly struck during the reign of the Sultān, under the management of Kajar Shāh.*

But the B. I. Text reads the sentence thus :

عهده دار مذکور درین عمل (عهد) مشهور کوشش بیش مینمود- چند لکهه تنکه را مهر ششگانی درعهد دولت سلطانی بعهده داری کجرشاه مهرزده بودند

T. F. 345, l. 1.

"The said superintendent made, in these spacious times, great exertions in regard to this matter and *Shashgānī*-pieces (*Muhr*) of the value of several *lakhs* of silver *tankas* had been struck in the prosperous reign of the Sulṭān under the superintendentship of Kajar Shāh."

There is nothing at all here to suggest or imply that the coin was 'new' and 'struck' or stamped or introduced for the *first* time by Fīrūz.

III. 359, *l.* **14.** *It was well-known in the world that government clerks and servants (Kārkun) were given to speculation.*

Dowson notes the various readings in the MSS. توافرات ـ توبدرات and افراط. According to the *Ghiyāṣu-l-Lughāt*, توفیر signifies آنچه در اجارهٔ فائده بردارند 'that which is acquired as a gain or profit from an *ijāra* (contract, lease, farm or monopoly)'.

The meaning here seems to be 'enhancing the gains or profits by more or less doubtful means, supplementing income by illegitimate increments, eking out emoluments or revenue by perquisites of some sort. But it may apply to the income or revenue of the State, as well as to the salaries or personal allowances of the clerks. Revenue officials are anxious to evince their zeal and earn *Kudos* with their masters by devising more or less improper and illegal methods of enhancing the total income of the State.

III. 359, *l.* 2 from foot. *The minister replied that it would be very impolitic to publish the secret rules of the manufacture of the coin.*

There is nothing corresponding to this in the B. I. Text, 346, l. 4. All that is said there is

در اهمال انداختن این کار محض غلط و امتحان کردن عین خطا

"To neglect this matter would be a great error and *not to* examine it a blunder". Should we not read امتحان نکردن ?

Dowson seems to have misunderstood a tangled, metaphorical sentence which just precedes it.

دستور مشهور رموز مستور غور کنوز بیرون داده ابواب اسرار ملکی کشاده

Ibid. l. 2.

"The renowned minister revealed the hidden secrets out of the depths of his cogitations and opening the doors of political mysteries," [said]:

III. 360, *l.* 4 from foot. *If there were no such ministers, the affairs of state would fall into confusion, and the animadversions of the high and low would be cast upon the most excellent institutions.*

But Shams himself winds up the sentence very differently. "Everyone, high and low, spoke in terms of high praise [of the *Wazīr's* wisdom]:"

آری اگر همچنین وزرای عاقل نباشند کار ملکی و کردار جهانداری بدشواری کشد - هریک خواص و عوام کلمات احسن صفات از زبان کشاد

T. F. 349, l. 9.

III. 361, *l.* 7 from foot. *The sum of thirty six lacs of tankas ...... was appropriated to the payment of wages (idrār) and 4200 afflicted persons received these monthly allowances.*

'Wages' is hardly the right word here. ادرار means 'giving liberally and continually', and also 'a pension.' They were charitable donations, stipends, eleemosynary allowances or grants made, not to 'afflicted persons', but to the ارباب استحقاق *q. v.* my note in S. I. M. H. Vol. I, pp. 541-2.

مبلغ سی و شش لک تنکه از بلاد ممالک بوجه ادرار تعین داشتند بلکه چهار هزار و دویست نفر که مدام دل ریش بودند از دیوان استحقاق مشاهره میبردند

T. F. 359 last line.

مشاهره means amount or allowance given monthly. There is nothing corresponding to 'afflicted' in the Text.

III. 363, *l*. 12. ***Pictures on banners and ensigns were also forbidden.***

The words used in the text are علمها و نشانهای مراتب همیشه صورت تصویر میکردند سلطان فیروز شاه آن جمله چیزها دور گردانید ۰

T. F. 374, l. 4 from foot.

This leaves no doubt as to the real meaning of مراتب "Pictures were always painted on banners and ensigns [accompanying] مراتب, *i. e.* trumpets, kettle-drums, pipes, etc. Sulṭān Fīrūz Shāh had them all removed."

III. 373 *l*. 7. ***But as money was continually coming in from ('Imādu-l-Mulk's) fief, which was handed over to Maqbūl, the perfumer, the Kror (of tankas), so long as the Sultān lived, was not diminished.***

بعده چون از اقطاعات و معاملات مال آمدی

T. F. 442, l. 7 from foot.

The parenthetical gloss is unwanted and there is no warrant for it in the Text. The amount was a floating balance or reserve. It was an advance to the Exchequer. When the State revenues from land and other sources came in, the debit was wiped off and the *Kror* remained as the balance in hand. The money did not come in from the private fiefs of 'Imādu-l-Mulk, but from the revenues of the State.'

III. 373, *l*. 4 from foot. ***Resignation (taslim kardan) of Fīroz Shāh to Khān-i-Jahān.***

But in the B. I. Text, the words used are تسلیم کردن تغلق شاه بخانجهان (36, l. 4). 'Handing over of [or entrusting] *Tughlaq* Shāh [his grandson] to Khān-i-Jahān,

This must refer to the installation of Tughlaq Shāh on the throne, during the life-time of Fīrūz, after the defeat and flight of Prince Muḥammad.

III. 377, *l*. 7. ***Amīrī-tarab......tah-bāzārī.***

I have explained this in the note on the passage in S. I. M. H. Vol. I, p. 340, as a cess or fee paid to an officer who regulated festive gatherings, dances, musical soirees, etc. In this connection, I may now point out that Ibn Baṭṭūṭa speaks of a quarter or market in

Dehlī which was called *Ṭarabābād* (*le sejour de l' allegresse* Defrémery, III. 155). He states that there was a similar طرب آباد in Daulatābād also, musicians, singers, female as well as male and dancers used to live here and had their shops. It was a grand place and richly decorated (*Ibid.* IV. 50).

Tah-Bāzārī is explained by the eminent Persian writer, Sirāju-d-dīn 'Alī Khān Ārzū as "cooks, vendors of bread, makers of pack-saddles [پالان دوز] and others who have stalls or occupy spaces towards the end or bottom of the market" (*Chirāgh-i-Hidāyat*, s. v.). A ground rent or cess had to be paid by them and this was also called *Tah-bāzārī*.

III. 383, *l.* 9. *The western wall of the tomb of Sultān Muizzu-d-dīn Sām and the planks of the door, had become old and rotten.*

There is some error in regard to the name of the person interred. Mu'izzu-d-dīn Sām's dead body is stated, by the chroniclers, to have been carried to Ghaznī after his assassination at Damyek (Ṭ. N. 128, l. 10; F. I. 60, l. 15). The reference is, *perhaps*, to the Mu'izzī College مدرسهٔ معزی near the Jāmi' Mosque of Dehlī. It is mentioned by Minhāj in connection with the Qaramiṭā riot in the reign of Raẓiyya (Ṭ. N. Text, 189, l. 15 = E. D. II. 336).

III. 394, *l.* 17. *The narrative given in this work, [the Malfūẓāt-i-Tīmūrī] or Tīmūr's expedition to India has been closely followed by Mīr Khond in the Rauzatu-s-Safā.*

This is a baseless conjecture which is flatly and decisively contradicted by Mīr Khwānd himself. He never mentions any autobiography of Tīmūr or any such work as the *Malfūẓāt* and explicitly declares that he has 'followed' and borrowed his whole account of Tīmūr from the *Ẓafarnāma* of Niẓām-i-Shanb-i-Ghāzānī (Bombay Lith. *Jild* VI. 66). In another place also, he observes that the author of that work had an interview with Tīmūr at Baghdād in 803 H. (*Ibid.* p. 108). See Rieu, I. 162 and also Price's 'Retrospect of Muhammadan History' (III. 154, 331). 'Abdu-r-Razzāq also admits that he is indebted for the summary of Tīmūr's career in his *Maṭla'u-s-Sa'dain* to the chronicle of Niẓām-i-Shāmī, as he calls this author (Rieu. I. 170). Khwānd Mīr acknowledges his obligations to the much better known *Ẓafarnāma* of Sharfu-d-dīn 'Alī Yazdī (*Ḥabību-s-Siyār*, Bombay Lith. III. iii. p. 1, l. 6 from foot). He also totally ignores the *Malfūẓāt*.

III. 408, *l.* 16. *Punishment of Mūsā Afghān.*

This passage has been dismissed too summarily by Dowson. Though it has no direct bearing on the History of India, it is not without interest in connection with the nomenclature of the Afghān tribes. Yazdī informs us that this Mūsā Aghwān (اغوان not افغان) belonged to the tribe of 'Kargas' کرگس which must be meant for the 'Gurghusht' or 'Ghorgusht' of the *Makhzan-i-Afghānī* and the *Nisābnāma*. Two other sects are also mentioned, *viz.* برنیانی and کلانی. They must be ntended for the 'Parnīs' and 'Karlārnīs', Karlānīs or 'Karrānīs'. The 'Parnīs' are said to be descended from "Parnaey, the brother of Kākar, the son of Danaey, the son of Ghurgusht" (Raverty : Notes on Afghānistān, 217. See also *Ibid.* 270). For the ancestry and legendary origin of the name Karlānī, *vide* Dorn. II, 129–130.

III. 414, *l.* **5.** *Marching forward, I halted on Saturday, the 1st of the month of Safar near Tulamba.*

Tīmūr has just said that he crossed the Indus on Tuesday, the 12th of Muḥarram (p. 409). According to the book-rule which assigns 30 days to Muḥarram, the first day of Ṣafar should have been a Sunday. This entry shows that only 29 days were reckoned to Muḥarram. The explanation is that the New Moon must have been seen on the evening of Friday, the 29th of Muḥarram.

On p. 415 (l. 14 from foot), it is stated that Tīmūr marched from Tulamba on Saturday, the 7th of Ṣafar and that the 13th of Ṣafar was Tuesday. Both these statements are inaccurate. The *Ẓafarnāma* says that the day of the month was the 8th هشتم not هفتم (E. D. III. 485). The 13th must have been a Thursday, as the 1st was a Saturday. The author of the *Malfūẓāt* himself declares that the 15th was a Saturday (*Ibid.* 419).

III. 430, *l.* **4**. *On the 13th, I marched again and halted near the bridge of Kotila, an ancient structure over the river Khagar.*

This place is identified in the Karnāl District Gazetteer (Edit. 1918), with 'Guhla', a small village on the borders of Patiālā. The old bridge by which Tīmūr crossed is still to be seen on the old Puran branch of the river" (*loc. cit.* 16, 224). The place is shown in the district map, about eighteen miles north of Kaithal and eight south of Dhanetā.

III. 449, *l.* **5.** ***On this day, Saiyed Shamsu-d-dīn Turmuzī and 'Alāu-d-dīn, nāib Karkarī, whom I had sent on an embassy to Bahādur Nāhir, at the city of Kutila, returned to my camp.***

Dowson refers the reader to a note of his own on p. 455, in which it is stated that "the valley of Kutīla, on the side of the Ganges", which is mentioned there is the valley of Hardwār. He is perfectly right so far as *that place* (which should be read as 'Kūpīla) is concerned, but quite wrong in identifying or rather mixing it up with *this* Kutīla, which is Kotla or Kotila in Mewāt, *q. v.* Note in S. I. M. H. Vol. I, p. 393. 'Kūpīla' (Hardwār) derives its name from the Muni Kapila. 'Kotila' or 'Kotla' is a diminutive form of 'Kot' fortress.

III. 465, *l.* **14.** *Capture of Nagarkot.*

This caption is unauthorized and misleading. There is not a word about the *capture* of the stronghold by the invader in the narrative which follows and all that is said about the place is that Tīmūr was informed of its being thirty *Kos* distant from the place where he was, somewhere in the Siwālik hills. Yazdī also is equally reticent and confines himself to the statement that his hero's encampment in the Siwālik mountain was fifteen *parasangs* distant from "the *country* of Nagarkot" (E. D. III. 515; Z̤. N. Text, II. 157, l. 7). Tīmūr is there said to have taken the forts belonging to Shaikha, a relative of Malik Shaikh Kūkar (Khokhar) and another belonging to Deva Rāi (E. D. III. 516–517); but neither of these could have been the stronghold of Nagarkot. The name of the Katoch Rājā who was ruling at Kāngra about this time is given in the 'Dynastic Lists' as Megha (r. 1390–1405 A. C.) and there is no name like Deva Rāi or Devapāl in the series (Duff, C, I. 306, *apud* A. S. R. Vol. V. 152). The *Malfūz̤āt* mentions Shaikhū's castle, but the name of Deva Rāi does not occur in Dowson's extracts from that work (E. D. III. 467–8).

III. 480, *l.* **18.** *Just at this time, he [Tīmūr] had resolved to......march against China (Khitā), with the intent of destroying the idol-temples, and of raising mosques in their places.*

This is what Yazdī says here, but elsewhere he declares, in connection with a later project to invade the same country, that Tīmūr's object was "the destruction of the idol-temples and *firetemples of Chīna* and Chinese Tartary"

Z̤afarnāma, II. 631, ll. 3, 5. بتخانها و آتشکدهاي چين و خطا.

III. 483, *l.* **11.** *Shahābu-d-dīn had dug a deep ditch and had raised high walls as means of defence there was a large lake there.*

و درحوالي آن محل حصين بحيره آب بزرگ بود

Z̤. N. II. 50, l. 1.

"And in the environs of that strongly-fortified place there was a large pond or pool of water."

"Raverty, in commenting upon this passage, states that Shihābu-d-dīn, "after his night attack upon the Mughals, who had appeared before 'Bhārah', his capital (also written 'Bharah', *the Bherah of the maps*), and his defeat, endeavoured to escape from thence by dropping down the Jamad, Behat or Jihlam towards Uchchh" (The Mehrān of Sind in J. A. S. B. 1892, p. 279 Note). But the attempted identification is an unfounded conjecture and it is nowhere said that 'Bhārah' or 'Bhera' was Shihābu-d-dīn's capital. بحیره is a common noun which means 'a lake, a small sea' (Richardson).

The *Rauzatu-s-Ṣafā* copies the very words and states that

در حوالی آن حصن حصین بود بحیرهٔ پہنا

Vol. II. *Jild* VI. p. 133, l. 3 from foot.

Hāfiz Ābrū speaks of the Sea of Aral as the بحیرهٔ خوارزم (Rieu, I. 423). The word may be diminutive form of بحر sea.

III. 485, *l.* 8. *While encamped on the river, the emperor was informed that Nusrat Kūkarī......had constructed a river fortress (rūd-Khāna-i-'ẓīm) on the banks of the river and was there posted.*

رودخانهٔ عظیم does not mean 'a river fortress', but 'a great river'. The word is used in this sense five times on pp. 291, ll. 18, 19, 25, 27, 33 of the *Tūzuk-i-Jahāngīrī* in connection with the rivers Nainsukh (Kunhār) or Kishengangā, cf. R. and B.'s Trans. II. 127-8. Khwāfī Khān also uses رودخانہا. The word is very commonly used for 'river' though as Sir Frederick Goldsmid points out, it 'strictly' means 'river-bed' (Eastern Persia, I, pp. viii and 197).

III. 494, *l.* 14 from foot. *On the 22nd, they arrived at Asandī, seven Kos from Kaital......On the 23rd, they marched from Asandī and arrived at the fort of Tughlikpūr, six Kos distant.*

Asandī (or Aspandī) is the village of 'Asandh', which lies five miles north of Safīdon. It is now included in the district of Karnāl. Safīdon is not in British India, but in the feudatory State of Jīnd. Tīmūr's 'Tughlikpūr' was either the *alias* of Safīdon itself or a new town or suburb founded by Fīrūz Tughlaq near it. In fact, Shams speaks, as if the two names were identical. He mentions it as تغلق پور عرف سپیدم 'Tughluqpur *alias* Sapīdam', 'Safīdon' and 'Asandh'.

are both entered separately in the Guide to Indian Post Offices and are marked in the Survey of India's 16 miles-to-an-inch map of the Punjab. Elliot appears to have been mistaken in supposing Asandī (or Aspandī) to be a *corrupt form* of Safīdon (Races. II. 132).

III. 495, *l.* 15. *On the 29th, Tīmūr passed the Jumna near the village of Palla and marched towards the fort of Lonī.*

The village of Palla still exists about seven miles north of Lonī and across the Jumna on the road to Pānīpat. It is now in Rohtāk district. Lonī is now in Meerut district.

III. 501, *l.* 6 from foot. *Sultān Mahmūd left the city by the Gate of Hauz-i-Rānī and Mallū Khān by the Barka Gate, both of which are to the south of the Jahān-panāh.*

برکہ means 'Tank, reservoir', and perhaps this 'Barka' was the *Hauz-i-Shamsī*, the great Tank built by Shamsu-d-dīn Iltutmish. This tank is situated to the south-west of Dehlī. There were two other great reservoirs in Dehlī, the *Hauz-i-Khāṣ* and the *Hauz-i-Rānī* and there were Darwāzas named after both of them. As Tīmūr was encamped near the *Hauz-i-Khāṣ*, Mallū Khān chose the Gate facing the other old hauz to make his exit.

III. 502, *l.* 18. *A poet also wrote some lines containing the date of the victory—8th Rabī'u-s-sānī, 801 (17th, Dec. 1398).*

The exact correspondence should be *18th* December, not 17th. 8th Rabī' II is explicitly said to have been a Wednesday in the couplet quoted in the *Malfūẓāt* (E. D. III. 443). As Wednesday was 18th December, the Julian equivalent given by Dowson must be wrong (See the Indian Ephemeris). 1st January 1399 was a Wednesday. The battle was fought on the 7th which Yazdī says was a Tuesday (Z. N. II, 97) = 17th December. The city was taken and Tīmūr's flag hoisted on it on Wednesday the 18th.

III. 525, *l.* 3 from foot. *On the forenoon of Monday, at the close of the month of Zī-l-hij, the victorious banners were displayed.*

30th Zī-l-ḥijja 686 H. was Thursday, 5th February, 1288 A. C. 29th Ẓi-l-ḥijja 687 H. was Monday, 24th January 1289 A. C. The year is not explicitly stated and the date is also expressed loosely and is not free from ambiguity. All that is said is

روز دو شنبہ بگہ چاشتگاہ . در سر ذی الحجہ بپایان ماہ .

Qirānu-s-Sa'dain, 'Alīgarh Text, 48, l. 5 from foot.

پایان ماه 'close of the month', does not necessarily mean the last day of the month and the exact date *may* have been the 27th. As 686 H. was an intercalary year, thirty days must have been reckoned to Ẕī-l-ḥijja.

III. 534, *l.* 5. *The Ghurratu-l-Kamāl is the third and longest of the four Dīwāns of Amīr Khusrū.*

Elliot was acquainted with and notices only four of these poetical collections, but the prolific and facile pen of the 'Parrot of Hind' appears to have been able to compose a fifth volume of the same sort. This 'last fruit of an old tree' is styled نهایة الکمال 'The end of perfection'. It contains a poem in celebration of Muḥammad Tughlaq's state entry into Dehlī after his accession in 725 H., an elegy on the assassination of Sulṭān Quṭbu-d-dīn Khaljī and several panegyrics addressed to Tughlaq Shāh I (Rieu : Catalogue, II. 613–4).

III. 538, *l.* 11 from foot. *At night, the Khān of Karra......fled with a few attendants to Injī, concealing his departure by the beating of drums.*

This must be Eichhī or Ijhī (or Enchhī), a *pargana* in Kora-Jahānābād, which subsequently came to be known as Ghāzīpūr (*Āīn*, Tr. II. 167; Elliot, Races. II. 107). This Ghāzīpūr is now in Fatḥpūr district (Constable, Pl. 28 B. C.) and lies ten miles south-west of Fatḥpūr town in Lat. 25° 49′N., Long 80°, 40′ E. (Th). The old village of Eichhī or Ijhī lies eight miles south-east of Ghāzīpūr town. It was an old Gautam stronghold and the *pargana* was known by its name till the cession of the district in 1801" (Fatḥpūr District Gazetteer, Ed. 1906, pp. 153, 218).

III. 540, *l.* 9. *On Monday, the last day of Muharram 690 H., the neighbourhood of the city was adorned by the King's return......*

The week-day does not work out correctly in this instance. 30th Muḥarram 690 H. was Friday, 2nd February 1291.

30th Muharram 691 H. was Tuesday, 22nd January 1292. But 691 H. is ruled out, as the poet states on p. 543, that the Sulṭān celebrated the second anniversary of his accession on 3rd Jumādī II, 690 H. and that he completed his poem seventeen days later, on 20th Jumādī II, 690 H. A few lines lower down on this page, 18th Rabī' I is said to have been a Thursday which is not in serial order with 30th Muḥarram Friday, according to the book-rule.

III. 540, *l*. 15. *On Thursday, the 18th of Rabī'u-l-awwal (690 H.) the Shāh held a Durbār.*

The Julian correspondence, according to the book-rule, was Wednesday, 21st March 1291 A. D. This 18th is, probably, 18th *Rūyyat.*

III. 585, *l*. 14. *Travels of Ibn Batūta.*

This is how the name is usually transliterated, but Dr. Horowitz contends that the name of the traveller should be transliterated as Ibn Baṭṭūṭa and cites as his authorities, the *Tāju-l-'arūs s. v.* batta and *Der Islam*, IV. 433 (Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica, 1911–2, p. 14).

III. 590, *l*. 11 from foot. *He (Quṭbu-d-dīn Aibak) was calumniated to the Sultān...... . Intelligence of this reached Kutbu-d-dīn.*

Like several other anecdotes related by Ibn Baṭṭūṭa in his account of the Sulṭāns of Dehlī, this story also is found in the *Futūḥu-s-Salāṭīn* of 'Iṣāmī (Text, pp. 82, 83; verses 1617–1642).

III. 594, *l*. 14. *Balban replied etc.*

Raverty laughs at this story and says "the traveller has mixed up an anecdote respecting the Atābak, Ilatt-giz of 'Irāq and Āzarbaijān, and that related of Shamsu-d-dīn Iyaltimish by our author into one delightful jumble" (Ṭ. N. Tr. 801 note).

The Iyaltimish story is that about losing the small piece of silver and the Dervish. But here again, 'Iṣāmī bears out Ibn Baṭṭūṭa and a similar legend about Iltutmish having at first refused to purchase Balban is told in the *Futūḥ*, where a variant of the 'small' piece of silver story is also found (pp. 117–118).

III. 616, *l*. 14 from foot. *In this battle, the Sultān (Muḥammad Tughlaq)......placed Shaikh 'Imādu-d-dīn, who resembled him (in person) under the royal canopy, while he himself moved off during the heat of the battle with 4000 men.*

This curious and interesting anecdote also is corroborated by 'Iṣāmī in his poem. He gives the personal name of the grandee who acted as the Sulṭān's 'double' as Ismā'īl and says he was the brother of Shaikh Ruknu-d-dīn of Multān (Lith. pp. 424–5).

VOL. IV. FĪRŪZ TUGHLAQ TO MUHAMMAD SŪR.

IV. 7, l. 9 from foot. *In the year 753 H. (1352 A. D.), on the 3rd of Jumādee-l-awwal, Prince Muhammad Khān was born in the capital (Shahar).*

The B. I. Text of the *Tārīkh-i-Mubārakshāhī* gives also the week-day as دوشنبم Monday (123, *l.* 9), and this is repeated in the T. A. (Lith. 114, *l.* 13, Bibl. Ind. Text, I. 228, *l.* 5 from foot, F. I. 146, *l.* 2). The Julian correspondence of the book-rule date was Sunday, 17th June 1352. The Hijra date must have been 3rd Jumādīu-l-awwal according to the *Rūyyat* reckoning.

IV. 8, l. 4. *The Bengālīs were defeated and many were slain. Saha Dev, their leader, with several others, was killed.*

T. M. 125, *l.* 4. ستیدانو مقدم نایکان آن روز کشتم شد

'Satīdānū (*variant*, Sahadeva), the leader of the *Nāyahs* was killed on that day.'

Here 'Nāyakān' may be an error for پایکان 'Pāiks'. The variant بایکان has no meaning and we may be sure that this man was the leader of the *Pāiks*—the Hindu footsoldiers or the territorial infantry of Bengal, the رجاله بنگال of Shams-i-Sirāj. Baranī also tells us that the rebel Tughril advanced with a large force of elephants and renowned *Pāiks* نامور پایکان (T. F. 83, *l.* 3 from foot) to meet Amīn Khān Itigīn, the general of Balban. And at p. 91, *l.* 4 from foot, he again states that after the suppression of the revolt, all the noted *Pāiks* of Tughril پایکان معروف طغرل were put to death along with his relatives and adherents. Similarly, in his narrative of Sultān Fīrūz Tughlaq's first invasion of Lakhnautī, he observes that Shamsu-d-dīn Ilyās, the governor of Lakhnautī, had got together a large number of "*Pāiks* and *Dhānks*" and made himself master of the whole of Bengal (T. F. 586, *l.* 11). And he afterwards declares that "the renowned *Pāiks* of Bengal" who had been boasting loudly of their courage and exploits threw down their swords and bows in the hour of battle and grovelled in the dust before the valiant hosts of the Dehlī Sultān (593, *l.* 2). This Sahadeva may have been the leader of these bellicose braggarts. See also the note on E. D. III. 297, *l.* 14 in S. I. M. H., Vol. I, 312. If the reading ستیدانو is preferred, it may be meant for 'Satyendra' ستیندر.

IV. 8, *l.* 17. *The Sultān [Fīrūz] ...... conducted a stream (jūī) from the river Saiadar (Sutlej) for a distance of forty Kos as far as Jhajjar.*

جوی از آب ستلدر بکشید تا جهجر که چهل و هشت کروه باشد ببرد

T. M. B. I. Text, 125, l. 3 from foot.

The Ṭ. A. Lith. reads جنجر (115, *l.* 6), the B. I. Text جهجر (I. 230, *l.* 4) and F. (I. 146, *l.* 16) turns it into جهجهر Jahjahr. Raverty points out that "there must be some error in the names, because "the Sutlej, where it issues from the hills at Ruh-par, its nearest point to Jhajhar, is about one hundred and seventy miles, and the nearest of its old channels to the west—the easternmost Nyewāl of the maps—is one hundred and forty miles to the westward of Jhajhar. Consequently, if Jhajhar is correct, the Sutlej cannot be meant and if the Sutlej is meant, then some other place than Jhajhar must be meant, to which it would have been far easier to have brought water from the Yamūnah" (The Mihrān of Sind and its tributaries in J. A. S. B. 1892 Pt. I. p. 268).

IV. 9, *l.* 2. *He brought another canal from the river Jumna.*

An important word is left out in this translation, though it is in the manuscripts. The river is called, not 'Jumna', but بدهي جون *Buḍḍhī* Jumna, *Old* Javan *i. e.* the old bed of the Jumna (Text, 126, *l.* 5).

The Ṭ. A. speaks of the river itself as بدهى Budhi (Lith. 115, *l.* 10; B. I. Text, I.), which shows that its author's copy of the T. M. had the word, but he could make nothing of it, as he was ignorant of Hindī.

This old bed of the Jumna is marked distinctly in the map attached to Major Cautley's article on the Canals of Fīrūz Shāh in J. A. S. B. 1833.

IV. 10, *l.* 7. *A coin was struck in his name.*

Dowson gives the words in his manuscript as سکہ بنام آورد ند but this is unidiomatic and the correct reading is سکہ بنام او زدند "They struck coins in his name" (T. M. 128, *l.* 9; Ṭ. A. B. I. Text, I. 231, *l.* 7 from foot). Coins exhibiting the name of the prince in association with his father's, in gold and billon, are fairly common (H. N. Wright: Coinage and Metrology of the Sultans of Dehli, Nos. 745–760).

The date of Sulṭān Fīrūz's arrival at Ikdāla is given as 13th سیزدهم Jumādī I in the text (128, *l.* 12), and not 16th as in Dowson. سیزدهم and شانزدهم are often confounded in Persian writing. 13th is probably correct as the Sulṭān is said to have left the place on the 20th.

IV. 10, *l.* 4 from foot. *The Sultān then marched. When he reached Sikhra (var. Sanhra, Sutghara), he attacked it, and the Rāi took to flight.*

As the restoration of this variously-written toponym to 'Sārangarh' which I have proposed in S. I. M. H., Vol. I, 387 has been challenged by a critic, it may be permissible to point out that the place is clearly called 'Sārang-garh' in a contemporary document. In the collection of letters and state papers which is known as the *Inshā-i-Māhrū* or *Tarassul-i-'Ainu-l-Mulkī*, there is an interesting document containing the following sentence : "When the heavenly banners of His Majesty (Fīrūz Shāh) put its shadow towards the environs of Banārasī Sārang-garh, the Rāi did not well understand the situation, as his day was unlucky and did not see his way other than in flight" (Maulavī 'Abdu-l-Walī's article on the Life and Letters of 'Ainu-l-Mulk Māhrū in J. A. S. B. 1923, p. 283).

It may be as well to say that there are two places called 'Sārangarh' or Sāranggarh'. Besides the feudatory state so called near Sambalpūr with which it can be identified, there is also a place of the same name about five miles south-west of Cuttack, across the Katjorī. It is frequently mentioned and has played a great part in the history of Orissa. It was "one of the nine forts which guarded the entrance to Khurda, the mountain fastness where the kings of Orissa sought refuge on the overthrow of their independence, and where they maintained themselves down to modern times" (J. Beames, Notes on Akbar's Sūbas—Orissa, J. R. A. S. 1896, p. 76). It is mentioned more than once in Abū-l-Fazl's account of Rājā Mānasinha's conquest of Orissa in 1592 (A. N. III. 615, 616, Tr. III. 941 and Note).

The remains of the old fort can be still seen near the railway station of Barang, which is eight miles from Cuttack (R. D. Banerji, History of Orissa, I. 252).

IV. 11, *l.* 2. *At this place [Sikra], Ahmad Khān, who had come up from Lakhnautī joined the Sultān in the hills of Ranthor.*

But the text reads it thus :

هم درین محل احمد خان که از لکهنوتی عطف کرده در کوه رنتهبور مانده
بود بحضرت پیوست

T. M. 129, l. 8.

"In this place, Aḥmad Khān who had turned away (gone aside or diverged from, given a wide berth to) Lakhnautī and was staying in the hills of *Rantahbūr*, joined His Majesty.'

He was, probably, a Bengal Amīr who had incurred the displeasure of Sulṭān Sikandar and been obliged to fly and seek refuge in the hilly regions which were still subject to Hindu princes at the time. The Ṭ. A. says he had fled گریختم from Lakhnautī (B. I. Text, I. 232, *l.* 8; Lith. 116, *l.* 11).

IV. 11, *l.* 17. *Some time afterwards, he heard that there was in the vicinity of Bardār a hill of earth, through the midst of which a large river flowed.*

I have ventured to suggest in the note on this passage in S. I. M. H. Vol. I, 388, that this name may be some sort of error for Rupār. It may be, therefore, pertinent to invite attention to the fact that a place called *Bardār* is still in existence near Rupār. "In the low hills of Taḥsīl Rupār near Bardār, there are", writes the compiler of the Ambāla District Gazetteer, "the remains of what is said to have been a Rajput stronghold, which must have been at one time an important place, judging from the number of old wells which have come to light at various times. From coins dug up during the rains, the place would appear to have been inhabited in the comparatively recent times before the Sikh conquest (*Op. Cit.* Ed. 1892–3, p. 21).

IV. 14, *l.* 8. *The fief of Gujarāt was granted to Malik Mufarrih Sultāni, who received the title of Farhatu-l-Mulk.*

مفرح signifies 'exhilarating' and is used also for any cordial or stimulant like wine. This man may have been the Sulṭān's cupbearer or *Sharābdār* (butler). The emperor Bābur tells us that the ancestors of the Sulṭāns of Gujarāt and Jaunpūr had been Fīrūz Tughlaq's cupbearers. Ẓafar Khān, who followed or ousted Malik Mufarriḥ and assumed independence as Muẓaffar I, also belonged to a caste which is said to have been called 'Tānk', because the Khatrīs had expelled their progenitor, on account of his addiction "to the use of strong drinks" (*Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bombay Lith. 1831, p. 2, *l.* 2 from foot; Tr. Bayley, 67).

IV. 14, *l.* 10 from foot. *Khargū fled and took refuge in the mountains of Kamāūn, in the country of the Maktās.*

MSS read مہتکان or مترکان (B. I. Text, 135, *l.* 7). Mr. E. T. Atkinson suggests that the people meant are the Meos or Mewātīs (Gazetteer of the Himalayan Districts of the N. W. Provinces).

IV. 16, *l.* 5. *Malik Bihzād Fath Khān.*

The variant 'Fatḥkhānī' of the British Museum manuscript (B. I. Text, 137 Footnote) is probably correct. Malik Bihzād had been a favourite slave of the deceased prince Fatḥ Khān, and was so called to distinguish him from other persons named Bihzād. The Ṭ. A. reads the name as بهزا رقبعاتي which is a palpable perversion of بهزاد فتح خاني (Lith. 118, *l.* 5 from foot; B. I. Text, I. 236, *l.* 3 from foot).

IV. 17, *l.* 6 from foot. ***That day tranquility was restored, and the people were satisfied.***

آن روز میان شهر رستخیزی عظیم آمد - خلق چون قرار گرفت

T. M. 139 last line. سلطان مرحوم تغلق شاه ... را ولي عهد كردانيد

"That day was as dreadful as the Day of Resurrection in the city [of Dehlī]. When tranquility was restored [after a time], the Sulṭān made Tughlaq Shāh his heir or successor."

IV. 19, *l.* 4. ***Khudāwand-zāda Ghiyāsu-d-dīn Turmuzī was placed over the armoury.***

عهدهٔ سرسلاحداري تعين كرد He was appointed commander of the *Salāḥdārs* or armour-bearers.

There was a *Sar Salāḥdār* and a *Sar Jāndār* of the Right (ميمنه) as well as of the Left (ميسره). 'Jāndārs' and 'Salāḥdārs' both stood on the right and left of the Sulṭān when he held court. They were two classes of the imperial body-guards or lifeguards. The word for 'armoury' is سلاح خانه or قورخانه.

IV. 19, *l.* 9 from foot. ***The royal forces followed to the confines of Gwāliyār in pursuit, but they met with opposition on the way ...... and returned.***

بیشتر راها مخالف دیدند - ملک فیروز علي و امراي دیگر از تعاقب مراجعت کردند

T. M. 142, *l.* 3 from foot.

"But they saw that the roads were, for the most part, impassable (dangerous or inhospitable) and so Malik Fīrūz 'Alī and the other Amīrs (turned back from or abandoned) the pursuit and returned." They were steep rugged mountain tracks.

IV. 24, *l.* 6. ***Malik Ismā'īl, son of the daughter of Sultān Fīroz Shāh was taken alive.***

The B. I. text of the T. M. speaks of him as

خواهرزادهٔ سلطان مرحوم

'*sister's* son' (149, *l.* 9) and the Ṭ. A. (B. I. Text I. 245, *l.* 1 from foot) and F. (I. 153, *l.* 4) have the same words.

IV. 28, *l.* 14. *Mubārak Khān, Malājūn (?)*

The B. I. text reads مبارک خان هلاجون as one name, here (T. M.156, *l.* 4) and also at 147, *l.* 2 from foot. Halājūn may be the name of Mubārak Khān's father. A Malik Halājūn (or Halāchūn) had revolted against Muḥammad Tughlaq at Lāhore in or about 1335 A. D. (Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, Defrémery, III. 332; *Futūḥu-s-Salāṭīn*, p. 451, verses 8653, 8659; T. M. 106, *l.* 12; B. I. 231, Tr. I. 309). This Mubārak Khān may have been his son. The Ṭ. A. (B. I. Text, I. 250, *l.* 7) speaks of him here as مبارک خان هلاجو though at I. 245, l. 5, the same name is printed مبارک و ملاجون wrongly.

IV. 31, *l.* 2 from foot. *Sambhal, Pānīpat, Jhajhar and Rohtak were in the possession of Sultān Nāṣiru-d-dīn.*

One of the MSS reads 'Sambhal', but another has سبيتر [سنپتر] (Text, 160, *l.* 3 from foot and footnote 7).

The Ṭ. A. also reads سونپت (B. I. Text I. 252 last line). The Lith. has سونپت (127, *l.* 6).

Sonpat is most probably correct, as all the other three places are in the same tract of country north of Dehlī and on the left of the Jumna. Sonpat is 28 miles, Jhajhar 35 miles, Rohtak 42 miles and Pānīpat 55 miles north-west of Dehlī. Sambhal lies in just the opposite direction about 90 miles east of Dehlī outside the Ganges-Jumna Doāb.

IV. 32, *l.* 12. *At length, some of the people of Malik Mardān Bhattī joined Sarang Khān.*

Malik Mardān was not a Bhaṭṭī and the sentence is, most probably, corrupt. The editor of the B. I. Text proposes to alter and emend it thus :

آخر بعضی غلامان ملک مردان نهی دادند و باسارنگخان یار شدند

T. M. 161, *l.* 7.

"At last, some of the slaves of Malik Mardān deserted (left him) and allied themselves with Sārang." But the Ṭ. A. reads

بعضی از غلامان ملک بهتی باسارنگخان پیوستند

(Lith. 127, *l.* 10, B. I. Text I. 253, *l.* 8) which may indicate that the word بهتي was in the copy used by the author of that work also. Malik Bhaṭṭī was probably, a powerful tribal chief who had formerly supported him. نهی دادند is not supported by manuscript authority, but it seems to be a short form of پهلوتهی کردند and makes good sense. The phrase is used by Aḥmad Yādgār who states that as Islām Shāh

Sūr had given secret orders to Ḥājjī Khān and Ghāzī Khān Sūr to give no assistance to Shujā'at Khān on the day of battle, they deserted and left him in the lurch.

261, *l.* 3. ازین جهت اورا تهی دادند و برجای خود ماندند

'Iṣāmī also uses a similar phrase (*Futūḥ*, p. 163, v. 3192).

بجای کہ لشکر تهی جملہ داد ـ چوبردان بیک تن در آنجا ستاد

Malik Mardān Daulat [not Marwān Daulat] is said by Muḥammad Bāqā, (one of the joint authors of the *Mirāt-i-'Ālam* who claims to be descended from him) to have been a person of good family, named Khwāja Ẓiyāu-d-dīn. He came from Herāt to India about 754 A. H. and was ennobled by Fīrūz Shāh Tughlaq (E. D. VII, 154–155).

IV. 32, *l.* 9 from foot. *Tātār Khān pursued him as far as Talwandī when he sent Rāi Kumālu-d-dīn Maīn in pursuit.*

Talwandī is a very common-place name in the Punjāb and fifteen composite village-names of which Talwandī is the first part and a distinctive suffix like Bhāl, Chandhriān, Khurd, Lālsing, etc. the second, are entered in the Post Office Guide. One of them is in Ludhiāna district and is called Talwandī-*i-Rāi* and as there is a town also called *Rāikot* in its vicinity, one is tempted to conjecture that it may be the 'Talwandī of Rāi Kamālu-d-dīn.' This village is again mentioned on p. 40 of this volume and there also it is stated that when Iqbāl Khān, who was marching to Multān, reached Talwandī-i-Rāi Kamālu-d-dīn, he seized Bahrām Khān, Rāi Dāūd Maīn and Rāi Hansū Bhaṭṭī and afterwards flayed Bahrām Khān alive (T. M. 173, *l.* 2 from foot). Elsewhere, we are told that when Jasrath Khokhar attacked Talwandī-i-Rāi Kamāl or Kamālu-d-dīn Maīn in 823 H., Rāi Fīrūz fled to the desert and Jasrath plundered the country from Ludhiāna to Rūpar (E. D. IV, 54 = T. M. Text, 194, *l.* 10). Lastly, this same author declares that in 836 H., Sulṭān Mubārakshāh marched from Sāmāna to *Talwandī-i-Rāi Fīrūz* and encamped there (E. D. IV, 77 = T. M. Text, 299, *l.* 2 from foot). All this indicates that this Talwandī belonged to certain chiefs called Rāis and was situated somewhere near Sāmāna and Ludhiāna. Rāi Fīrūz seems to have been the younger brother or son of Rāi Kamālu-d-dīn.

The descendants of Kamālu-d-dīn are still found in the Ludhīāna district and are known as the Rāis of Rāikot. Their family history is thus related.

"About the year 1308 *Samvat*, there was a Rājā of Jaisalmīr and Bhatner, named Dulchī Rām or Bersī. He had a son named Tulsī Dās, who embraced Islam and assumed the name, Shaikh Chacho. He murdered the Rājā of Hattūr and took possession of it. He had two sons, Pahrū, who remained at Hattur and Nopāl. Pahru had two sons Rāi Datta and Rai Jaggū. They received from a Sulṭān 'Alāu-d-dīn the *pargana* of Tihāra × × Rāi Datta had a son named Rāi Kamālu-d-dīn. Many of the villages in Ludhiāna district were founded or refounded by these Rāis. Some still bear the names of individual members of this family and others, as for instance, Jagrāon, Rāikot and Talwandī-i-Rāi have incorporated the word Rāi itself. × × One Rāi Kalla colonised Talwandī-i-Rāi and another Rāi Kallā built Rāikot. Jagraon was founded by another member of the family named Kamālu-d-dīn, in 1125 Hijri." This is what is stated by Mr. W. H. Tolbort in an article on the District of Ludhiāna, in J. A. S. B. 1869, pp. 90-91. A very similar account will be found with the usual variations in names and minor details—in the Ludhiāna District Gazetteer. It is there stated that while Bharū (or Pharū) possessed himself of Hattūr, his brother Lapāl (or Nopāl) settled in the adjoining village of Shāhjahānpūr, which his descendants still hold. Kallā I is said there to have been his seventh descendant and to have founded Talwandī, to which place the family removed and obtained the assignment of the *Mālguzārī* of the villages in the neighbourhood.

A *Maqbara* (Mausoleum) or *'Idgāh* built by Rāi Pharū (or Fīrūz) still exists at Hattūr (Punjab District Gazetteer, XV. 75 and 227). There is a reference to these Rāis and their ancestor, Tulsīdās or Shaikh Chacho, in the Jullunder District Gazetteer also, where the connection of the Bhaṭṭis and the Manjs (or Mains) is thus accounted for Achhal founded Jaisalmīr. His son Jagpāl had two sons, Chūn and Dhan. Manj was the son of Chūn and Bhaṭṭī of Dhan. Tulsīdās was the son of Jairsī, the son of Mokhal, a descendant of Manj. The Manjs became Musalmāns, while most of the Bhaṭṭis adhered still to the old faith (Edit. 1904, p. 75).

There are many discrepancies in these traditions as they are now related and the chronology is hopelessly confused and irreconcilable; but there can be little doubt that they contain a kernel of truth. The names Kamālu-d-dīn and Fīrūz are obviously the Islamic forms of the Hindu Kallā and Pharū. It may be also asserted with safety that the

local traditions are absolutely independent of the references in the *Tārīkh-i-Mubārakshāhī.*

Hattūr, the oldest seat of the family, is now a village in Jagrāon in Ludhiāna and lies about 34 miles south-west of Ludhiāna, and six miles south of Bassīān. Talwandī is about the same distance north of Bassīān, and there is a village called Kamālpūr also about two miles north of Talwandī. Jagrāon is 24 miles west of Ludhiāna town and Talwandī about ten miles south-west of Jagrāon (See the map of the district).

IV. 35, *l.* 12 from foot. *Khizr Khān, ... Bahādur Nāhir, Mubārak Khān and Zīrak Khān, by the favour of Amīr Tīmūr, were admitted to an interview, but with the exception of Khizr Khān, they were all put into prison.*

T. M. 166, *l.* 5 from foot. بعهد و امان امیر تیمور را ملاقات کردند

They had gone to him only after receiving a promise [عہد] of personal security or safety [امان]. The fact that three out of the four Amīrs were taken into custody and deprived of their liberty is mentioned by the author to emphasise the flagrant violation of the pact by Tīmūr. The gravamen of the charge lies in his having given them a pledge or his word of honour and then perfidiously broken it. If they had been "admitted to an interview only *by his favour*" there would have been no cause for complaint.

A few lines lower down, this author again charges this sanguinary tyrant with having got hold of Shaikh Khokhar also by a similar "promise of safety and pledge with the right hand."

T. M. 167, *l.* 2. بامان و دست راست دست آورده

and then thrown him as well as his wife and children and dependents into prison.

Dowson has left out and slurred over the incriminating words in his rendering of that passage also (p. 35, *l.* 5 from foot).

IV. 39, *l.* 17. *The son of Bīram Deo advanced to meet Ikbāl Khān.*

There is nothing corresponding to the words 'son of' in the original (T. M. 171, *l.* 2) and the interpolation may be safely rejected as the Ṭ. A. (Lith. 130, *l.* 16; B. I. Text I. 259, *l.* 9) and F. (I. 160, *l.* 9) make no mention of the son.

IV. 40, *l.* 16. *From thence, Ikbāl Khān marched towards Multān. When he reached Talwandī, Rāi Kamālu-d-dīn arrived. Here he seized Bahrām Khān, Rāi Dāūd Kamāl Main, etc.*

ازانجا سمت ملتان عزیمت فرمود چون در تلوندی رای کمال مین رسید
بهرام خان و راي داود کمال مین و راي هینو ذوالجی بهتی را دست آورد

T. M. 173, *l.* 2 from foot.

"When he arrived at the [village of] Talwandī *of* [or which was named after] Rāi Kamāl Maīn, he seized Bahrām Khān, and Rāi Dāūd Kamāl Maīn and Rāi Hainū, the son of Dhawālji Bhaṭṭī". The T. A. copies the T. M. word for word (B. I. Text, I. 260, l. 5).

IV. 42, *l.* 11. *Daulat Khān Lodī had been sent against Sāmāna.*

Delete 'Lodī' for which there is no authority in the text, in which all that is said is that

دولت خان در جانب سامانه نامزد شده بود

T. M. 176, *l.* 3 from foot.

His name occurs on at least six other pages 174, 177, 178, 180, 18·, 189, but he is no where called Lodī by the author of the T. M. Firishta (I. 160, *ll.* 3.2 from foot, 161, l.8, 9, 12, 13 from foot) is responsible for having misled Elphinstone (H. I. Ed. 1866, p. 417) and even Mr. Nelson Wright in calling him a Lodī (C. M. S. D. 239). Niẓāmu-d-dīn observes a wise reticence and eschews any cognomen or sobriquet (Lith. 132, 133, B. I. Text I. 262, 263, 264). Budāūnī also ignores the *nisba*, but Sir W. Haig has, as usual, allowed himself to be misled by Firishta (C. H. I. III. 203–4).

IV. 42, *l.* 16. *But after a time, Daulat Khān forgave him and patronised him (Bairām Khān).*

T. M. 177, *l.* 3. بعده بر امان و دست راست دولت خان را پیوست

"After a time, he joined (or surrendered to) Daulat Khān on receiving from him a pledge of safety and a promise with the right hand [of honorable treatment]." The T. A. has

B. I. Text, I. 262, *l.* 8. و آخر امان خواسته دولتخانرا دید

IV. 43, *l.* 11 *Khizr Khān withdrew across the Jumna into the Doāb, but meeting with resistance there, he recrossed the river and marched to Fathpūr.*

مسند عالی آب جون را عبره کرده درمیان دو آب در آمد . از آنجا
مقابل اندری باز آن طرف آب شده بکوچ متواتر در فتحپور رفت

T. M. 173, *l.* 8.

"Khiẓr Khān crossed the Jumna and entered the Dūāb, but re-crossing it (again) opposite to Indrī, went over to the other side of the river and by continuous marches proceeded to Fatḥpūr."

IV. 44, l. 4. *Malik Idrīs and Malik Mubāriz Khān his brother, received the Khitta of Hānsī, and were honoured by being allowed to kiss the feet.*

There is nothing in the text to warrant the statement about their having received the district of Hānsī (as *jāgīr*).

ملک ادریس و مبارز خان برادر او درخطهٔ هانسي بشرف پای بوس مشرف شدند

Text, 179, *l.* 8.

"They obtained the honour of kissing the feet [of Khiẓr Khān] in the district of Hānsī". All that they received in Hānsī was this empty 'honour', not the government or the fief. The Ṭ. A. also states that they "went forward to meet him and paid him homage in Hānsī."

استقبال نموده درهانسی ملازمت نمودند

B. I. Text I. 263, *l.* 16.

F. uses the very same words (I. 161, *l.* 11).

IV. 45, *l.* 4 from foot. *Khizr Khān, thus obtained possession of Dehlī on the 8th of Rabī'u-l-awwal 817 H. (23rd May, 1414 A. D.).*

Elliot's MS. of the T. M. reads the date as 8th Rabī' I. The British Museum copy has 7th and another manuscript makes it 17th (B. I. Text 181 footnote). The Ṭ. A. gives the date as 15th "Rabī'u-l-awwal and the year as 817 H. (B. I. Text I. 265, *l.* 3 ff. Lithograph, 133 last line). F. says Daulat Khān surrendered the fort of Sīrī on the 15th of Rabī' I, 817 (I. 161, *l.* 8 from foot), while B. gives 17th Rabī' I, 816. 8th Rabī'u-l-awwal 817 H. was not 23rd May, but Monday *28th* May 1414 (Ind. Ephem.).

IV. 50, *l.* 12 from foot. *In 822 H. (1419 A. D.), Khizr Khān marched against Katehr.*

All the copies of the text have 821 H. (188, *l.* 11) and the Ṭ. A. also explicitly states that this second invasion of Katehr took place in the same year as the first هم درسنهٔ مذکور (I. 268, *l.* 12).

F. copies these words, according to his wont (I. 162, l. 3 from foot). Tāju-l-Mulk returned from his invasion of Katehr in Rabī' II, 821 H. Khiẓr Khān's punitive expedition must have been undertaken a few months later. It was followed by the siege of Budāūn, which

was commenced in Ẓī-l-ḥijja 821 H. and had to be raised after six months on account of the dangerous machinations of Qiwām Khān and his fellow conspirators. They were beheaded in Jumādī I, 822 H. The chronology of the T. M. is perfectly consistent and 822 *must be* wrong.

IV. 50, *l.* 3 from foot. *He [Khiẓr Khān] received information that a conspiracy had been formed against him by some amīrs and maliks of the late Mahmūd Shāh who had been overpowered by Daulat Khān.*

But these Amīrs and Maliks are described in the text as بندگان محمود شاهي کہ از دولت خان شکستہ و رایات اعلی را پیوستہ بودند

T. M. 189, *l.* 3.

The men who now meditated treachery [غدر اندیشیدند] were the old servants of the late Maḥmūd Shāh, who had formerly *broken away from*, *i. e.* deserted, or abandoned the party or faction of Daulat Khān and joined the *Rāyāt-i-Ā'lā* *i. e.* Khiẓr Khān (See p. 44). They were now playing the old game and preparing to turn their coats once more.

That this is the true meaning of شکستہ here is evinced by the fact that the T. A. (Lith. 135, *l.* 13) and F. (I. 163, *l.* 1) employ the synonymous expression از دولت خان جدا شده in the counterpart passage. Ranking makes Budāūnī say that they had "seceded from Daulat Khān and had espoused the cause of Khiẓr Khān (Tr. I. 380; Text I. 288). The phrase used by Budāūnī is از دولت خان تخلف نموده.

IV. 51, *l.* 7 from foot. *He fled to the town of Tarsarī, one of the dependencies of Sirhind.*

The place is called لهوری in the B. I. text and there are also the variants لهرسری Lahrsari (190, *l.* 3) and طرسري. The last looks like a miswriting of لهرسری Lahra Sarāī? In the Ṭ. A. also, the name appears as لهوری (Lith. 135, *l.* 7 from foot; B. I. text, 269, *l.* 6). There is a village called Lahrah in Sirhind, on the route from Hānsī to Ludhiāna, sixteen miles south of the latter. Lat. 30°-42′ N., Long. 75°-53′ E. (Thornton) or about ten miles north of Sirhind.

Khwāja 'Alī's sobriquet or *nisba* is 'Māzandarānī' in the B. I. text (190, *l.* 3) and the Ṭ. A. rings another change upon it and calls him 'Andarānī.'

Jhath is, most probably, Chuth in the Banūr tahṣīl of the Pinjaur Niẓāmat of Patiāla State. It is an ancient village lying seven miles

south of Banūr town. Lat. 30°-36′ N, Long. 76°-50′ E. It contains an old fort and many ruins of old buildings (Punjab District Gazetteer, Phulkian States, Vol. XVII A. 1909, p. 193). One of the four main branches of the Bārhā Sayyids is known as the Chat-Banūrī, from this Chat or Chuth, which lies about 16 miles north of Ambāla and Banūr is 12 miles north-west of it (Proc. A. S. B. 1871, p. 261, Irvine, Later Mughals. I. 201 Note).

IV. 54, *l.* 13 from foot. *He (Jasrath) attached Rāi Kamālu-d-dīn Maīn at Talwandī. Rāi Fīrūz fled before him to the desert.*

Jasrath did not attack Rāi Kamālu-d-dīn himself, but the *Talwandī of Rāi Kamālu-d-dīn i. e.* the Talwandī bearing his name probably because it had been founded by him. Rāi Kamālu-d-dīn was not alive at this time.

[جسرتهر] باجمعي از سوار و پياده گذارا آب بياه و ستلدر شده و تلوندی
T. M. 194, *l.* 9. راي کمال الدين مئين را تاخت

The person who was in possession and who was obliged to take refuge in flight was his son (?) or successor, Rāi Fīrūz. The Ṭ. A. (B. I. Text, I. 271, *l.* 13) and F. (I. 163, *l.* 5 from foot) both state that it was the Talwandī of (or belonging to) the Rāi that was plundered, but they make Rāi Fīrūz fly to the *Jumna* (جون), instead of to the *desert* (جول). They appear to have been puzzled by the word and misread it.

IV. 57, *l.* 12. *On the following day, he (Jasrath) went down the Rāvī. There having assembled the wise men ('Ulamā), he ...... fell back one Kos from Lāhor.*

The word in the B. I. text is not علما but غلها 'grains, cereals' از آنجا غلها جمع كرده (T. M. 198, *l.* 7). One of the MSS reads علما, but this seems to have been rightly rejected by the editor. The marauder seems to have collected supplies for his troops and cattle before retiring.

IV. 62, *l.* 6. *Fourteen months afterwards, on the 11th Muharram 830 H. ...... he proceeded to Mewāt, and after punishing the disaffected there, marched to Bayāna.*

This passage has been translated by Dowson at second hand from the Ṭ. A. as his Manuscript had a *lacuna* here. The immediately preceding event recorded in the T. M. is the return of the Sulṭān to

Dehlī in Sha'bān 829 H. (T. M. 205, *l.* 2). The Ṭ. A. relates the defeat of Jallū and Qaddū in 829 H. without specifying the month and then states that the march to Mewāt and Bayāna was undertaken four months (and eleven days) afterwards in Muḥarram 830 H. (Lith. 139, *l.* 9 from foot; B. I. text, I. 286, *l.* 14).

'Fourteen' is an error for 'four'. The substance of the additional matter in the T. M. is that after Qaddū had submitted and been granted an audience, he showed a disposition to run away to his native hills and had to be thrown into prison. Mubārak Shāh then again harried and ravaged Mewāt and returned to Dehlī in Sha'bān 829 H.

In the Muḥarram of the following year 830 H. (*i. e. four* months afterwards), he marched towards Bayāna, and while passing through Mewāt, on the way, chastised the contumacious and truculent inhabitants of the district (204, *l.* 3 from foot). F. also states that the Sulṭān marched to Bayāna on the 11th of Muharram 830 H., four months چهار ماه after his return to Dehlī in 829 H. (I. 165, *l.* 14).

IV. 64, *l.* 13 from foot. *On the 17th Jumāda-l-ākhir, Sharkī drew up all his forces.*

The date should be 7th, as it is given in the text, 208, *l.* 6 from foot. Dowson himself subsequently says that the Jaunpūr king crossed from Gudrang (?) to Rāprī and retreated from thence to his own country on the 17th of Jumāda-l-ākhir *i. e.* ten days later, on p. 65.

IV. 66, *l.* 15. *Jalāl Khān ...... and some other chiefs [of Mewāt] ...... assembled in the fort of Alwar.*

All the three manuscripts which were available to the editor of the B. I. text have Andūr or Andwar اندور, not الور (212, *l.* 3 and footnote).

The Ṭ. A. perverts it into قلعهٔ اندرون 'Inner fort'? (Lith. 141, *l.* 5; B. I., I. 279, *l.* 9); but this perversion may indicate that اندور is the right name. F. calls it اندور (I. 166, *l.* 11). Alwar was not a place of any importance at this time. Bābur says that the capital of Mewāt was removed to Alwar from Tijāra only after his own capture of Lāhore and Debālpur in 930 H. (B. N. Tr. 578).

IV. 71, *l.* 19. *'Khān-i-A'ẓam Kāl Khān'.*

Read '*Kamāl* Khān' as on *l.* 3 from foot of this page and in T. M. B. I. text, 220, *l.* 6 from foot; Ṭ. A. B. I. text, I. 282, *l.* 16.

IV. 77, *l.* 8. ***He hastened on and crossed (the Rāvī) at the ford of Pohī,***

Dowson states in the footnote that the words in brackets have been inserted on the authority of Budāūnī, but that author, far from making any such statement, declares (according to the B. I. text) that the Sulṭān *crossed the Biyāh at Pūhi* (I. 297, Tr. I. 392).

و ازآنجا [سامانر] بگزر پوهی آمده از آب بیاه عبور کرده بر دیبا لپور رسید

It may be as well to cite the words of the T. M. itself

Text. 230, *l.* 2. خود بر سبیل تعجیل در گذر بوهي رفت

This is also what the Ṭ. A. (Lith. 144, *l.* 7 from foot; B. I. text, 285 last line) has to tell us.

'Rāvī' is almost certainly wrong as at E. D. IV. 57, Maliku-sh-Sharq is said to have "crossed the *Biyāh* at the ford of Būhī, or as the B. I. text puts it نزدیک گذر بوهی لب آب بیاه را عبره کرد (T. M. 217, *l.* 7 from foot).

Here also, Budāūnī has copied these words (Text, I. 291, *l.* 2, on *l.* 11 also of this page). 'Rāvī' seems to be an error for Biyāh, as the T. M. explicitly states that

لشکر منصور در نواحی دیبالپور رسید و آب بیاه را عبره کرده در
T. M. 230, *l.* 3. کرانهٔ راوي نزول فرمود

The river crossed near Debālpūr was the *Biyāh*. The army took up its quarters on the bank of the Rāvī and at some distance from the Biyāh, only *after* the latter had been crossed.

IV. 78, *l.* 6. *The duties of dīwān and wazīr were not effectively discharged by Sarwaru-l-mulk. So .... the dīwān-i-ishrāf was transferred to Kamālu-l-mulk and the office of wazīr only was confirmed to Sarwaru-l-mulk.*

The meaning seems to be that Kamālu-l-mulk was appointed *Mushrif-i-dīwānī-i-Wizārat, i. e.* Head of the Revenue Department of the Prime Minister's Office. This '*dīwān-i-ishrāf*' appears to be identical with the ***ishrāf-i-mamlakat*** of Baihaqī. See my note on E. D. II. 74, *l.* 3 in this volume.

IV. 78, *l.* 12 from foot. ***Mīrān Sāhib ...... Kāẓī 'Abdu-s-Samad Khān Hājib and others conspired with him.***

Read 'Mīrān Ṣadr'. 'Khān Ḥājib' also is a copyist's error for ***Khāṣ*** Ḥājib خاص حاجب (T. M. text, 232, *ll.* 6, 7 from foot); cf. also Ṭ. A. (B. I. text, I. 286 last line) and F. (I. 169, *l.* 3). Mīrān Ṣadr held the office of '*Āriẓ*. He was probably a noble Sayyid (Mīrān) whose personal name was Ṣadru-d-dīn. The Ṭ. A. (Lith. 145, *l.* 8;

B. I. text I. 287, *l.* 1) and F. (I. 169, *l.* 3) state that Qāẓī 'Abdu-ṣ-Ṣamad was the *Khāṣ Ḥājib,* for the meaning of which see the note on E. D. II. 373, *l.* 9 in this volume.

IV. 81, *l.* 17. *The opposing forces met near the Khatīra of the prince.*

خطیره is a miswriting for حظیره *Ḥaẓīra* (T. M. text, 238, *l.* 14). The mistake occurs again on p. 83, *l.* 4 from foot. The plural form حظائر is used by Shams-i-Sirāj (T. F. 332, *l.* 1; 333, *l.* 7). حظر means 'prohibiting, secluding' and حظار of which حظیره is the feminine, means 'wall, parapet, sheepfold, enclosed garden or mausoleum.'

The name 'Kambal' (last line) is spelt کبک 'Kabak' in the T. M. (239, *l.* 9), کبک in the T. A. (B. I. text, 288 last line) and کنک in F. (I. 170, *l.* 1). Kabak or Kapak is most probably the correct form.

IV. 84, *l.* 18. *They also received golden girdles and splendid head-dresses and fiefs.*

و نیز بند زر و مراتب و دمامہ و اقطاعات یافتند

T. M. 243, *l.* 7.

مراتب و دمامہ were banners or standards with drums, not 'head dresses'. So Khwāfī Khān writes that Shāh Jahān bestowed *naqqāras* and other *marātib* نقاره و دیگر مراتب on 'Alī Mardān Khān (M. L. I. 560, *l.* 3 ff.). This shows that the word was used in this sense so late as the middle of the seventeenth century.

IV. 113, *l.* 2. *The King [of Bījānagar] was seated in great state in the forty pillared hall.*

This word چہل ستون is really used for any large mansion or palace. چہل is used here not for 'forty', but for any indefinitely large number, just like صد and هزار. So the centipede is called هزار پای and also صد پای and چہل پای. Similarly چہلہ or چہل تہ and چہلم is a thickly padded surcoat which is used as a sort of armour and is so called because it is made up of an indefinite number of folds. So the Turkī slaves of Iltutmish who were called ترکان چہلگانی were not exactly forty in number and Minhāj's biographical notices relate to only twenty five altogether (T. N. 229–324). 'Alī Bābā's forty thieves' and the 'Forty Vazirs' of the *Bakhtyār Nāma* are examples provided by oriental folklore. Compare also the English phrases 'forty winks', 'A, B, C and forty more'. Coriolanus says 'I could beat forty of them' (iii. i.) and Othello complains that 'the slave had *forty* thousand lives' (iii. i.).

IV. 146, *l.* 12. *Kutbu-d-dīn Aibak ruled twenty years, during fourteen years of which period he held himself independent of the Sultān and had the Khutba read in his own name.*

So also in the *Ḥabību-s-Sīyar*, Vol. I. *Jild* II. *Juzv.* IV. 159, *l.* 2. Quṭbu-d-dīn ruled independently only for about *four* years from Shaʿbān 602 to 607 H. Khwāndmīr probably meant to write that he ruled *dependently*, *i. e.* only as a viceroy for about fourteen years from 588 to 602 H.

IV. 149, *l.* 14. *Sultān Mahmūd had an intense love for slaves (possessing faces as fair as that of the planet Jupiter).*

Khwāndmīr must have got this story, which does not redound to the credit either of the Sulṭān or of his minister, from the *Jawāmiʿu-l-Ḥikāyāt* of ʿAwfī' (Niẓamu-d-dīn, Introduction, pp. 171, 213; Nos. 782, 1536), who cites the *Tārīkh-i-Yamīnī* as his authority.

Maḥmūd is said to have had a dirty squabble about a slave with Isfarāīnī's successor, Aḥmad Ḥasan Maimandī also (ʿAwfī, J. Ḥ. p. 170, Story No. 759). The raconteur contrasts the meanness of Aḥmad with the generosity of the Niẓāmu-l-Mulk who "enlisted two thousand slave girls in the service of Malik Shāh Seljūqī at a slight hint" from his master.

IV. 151, *l.* 15. *It is recorded in the Rauzatu-s-Safā that when Sultān Mahmūd.. ......was on his march against Abū Alī Sīmjūr etc.*

This story also has been borrowed by Khwāndmīr from ʿAwfī' (Niẓāmu-d-dīn, J. Ḥ. p. 191, Story No. 1172).

IV. 162, *l.* 13. *It was agreed that Jaipāl should deliver over quickly 1000 dirhams and fifty elephants.*

Correctly, 'one hundred *thousand dirhams*', as in the Bombay Lithograph of the *Ḥabību-s-Sīyar*, Vol. I, *Jild* II, *Juzv.* IV. 19, *l.* 3. See also ʿUtbī, E. D. II. 21; *Rauẓatu-s-Ṣafā*, *Jild* IV. p. 38, *l.* 3.

IV. 181, *l.* 8. *The ignorant Hindūs when smitten with fear, assemble in this temple.*

جهال هند هرگاه کم خسوف واقع میشد در آن بتخانم مجتمع میگشتند

Ḥabību-s-Sīyar Vol. I, *Jild* II, *Juzv* IV. 24, *l.* 13.

"And the ignorant people of Hind used to gather together in that idol-temple, whenever there was an eclipse (to bathe in the sea). Khwāndmīr has borrowed the passage from the *Rauẓatu-s-Ṣafā* of his

grandfather (Bombay Lith. of 1842, *Jild* IV. p. 47, *l.* 7 from foot) who has translated it from Ibna-l-Athīr (*q. v.* E. D. II. 468). The error is due to خسوف 'eclipse' having been miswritten or misread as خوف 'alarm, fear'.

IV. 195, *l.* **3.** *During the latter days of his prosperity. Mas'ūd again made war upon the cities of Hind and on his return from the Indus, Noshtigīn and the sons of Alī Kheshāwand .... seized him.*

But what Khwāndmīr really says is در وقتی کہ از آب سند بگذشت (H. S. Vol. I. *Jild* II. *Juzv.* IV. 29, *l.* 10) 'at the time when he had crossed the Indus'.

The mutiny took place, not when he was returning from India to Ghaznī, but when he was marching from Ghaznī to the Punjāb. Khwāndmīr states elsewhere that Noshtigīn "plundered the treasury when "Mas'ūd himself had crossed over the Sind, but all his baggage and property was on this side of the river" (E. D. IV. 198; H. S. Vol. II, Jild. II. 4, p. 30, *l.* 11). There is nothing corresponding to the word 'return' in the text. The Sulṭān never returned from India to Ghaznī. He was put to death soon afterwards.

IV. 196, *l.* **14** *Mas'ūd having sent for Abū Nasr Ahmad bin 'Abdu-s-Samad, who was the accountant of Harūn appointed him wazīr.*

'Abdu-s-Samad is said to have been Harūn's صاحب دیوان and کدخدا by Baihaqī (Text, 439, *l.* 7 from foot) which means that he was his general manager or controller of the Department of Revenue and Finance. He was in fact his prime minister the 'Lord High Steward of the kingdom.

IV. 243, *l.* 9 from foot. *On reaching [Pānīpat], he ['Ālam Khān] contrived by a stratagem to get three or four lacs from Miān Sulaimān and went on his way.*

Erskine hazarded the conjecture that this man was "a rich Shroff or Banker", and Dowson and Mrs. Beveridge (B. N. Tr. 457 note) have acquiesced in and copied it. I venture to put forward something more definite and suggest that he was Miān or Shaikh Sulaimān Farmulī, the son of the Khān-i-Khānān Farmulī. He had a brother named 'Imād and their quarrels are mentioned in the *Makhzan-i-Afghānī* (E. D. V. 97; T. A. Lith. 164, *l.* 14 and F. I. 183, *l.* 5). Some time later, he incurred the displeasure of Sulṭān Sikandar Lodī for

declining to accept a military command at a distance from Court, and he was ordered to be dismissed from office and deprived of his military fiefs (Dorn. I. 104; Ṭ. A. 168, *l.* 9 from foot; F. I. 185, *l.* 14). In this connection, Niẓāmu-d-dīn informs us that the ***pargana*** of ***Indrī*** was assigned to him as *Madad-i-Maʿāsh* (168, *l.* 5 from foot). Firishta prefixes the title ʿMiān' to his name. The Shaikhzādas of Farmul were given this honorific epithet because they were the descendants of a renowned *pīr* named Shaikh Muḥammad Musalmān. Shaikh Bāyazīd Farmulī is called ʿMiān' by ʿAbbās (E. D. IV. 347) and Shaikh Muḥammad Farmulī is styled ʿMiān' in the *Tarīkh-i-Dāūdī* (*Ibid.* 457).

Bābur also interchanges these handles to Sulaimān's name. He calls him ʿMiān' here, while on the preceding page, he says that ʿSulaimān Shaikhzāda' joined ʿĀlam Khān, when the latter reached Indrī. Niẓāmu-d-dīn repeats these words (Lith. 181, *l.* 14) and as he tells us that the revenues of that *pargana* had been assigned before to Sulaimān as subsistence allowance or pension, the identification becomes complete. He was neither a banker, nor a shroff, but a wealthy Afghān noble who had inherited from his father a large fortune and enhanced it considerably by his own acquisitions.

IV. 271, *l.* 8 from foot. *On Saturday, the 13th of the latter Jumāda, ...we reached the ground that had been prepared for* [*the battle of Kânhwa*].

Sir A. Cunningham complains that "Bābur has not given the week-day correctly, as 13th Jumāda II. 933, 17th March 1527 by the Tables, was a Sunday". He states that "this is also proved from Bābur's own statements of other dates in the same year". Thus he calls

"24th	Muḥarram 933	Wednesday.
15th	Ṣafar	Wednesday.
16th	Rabīʿ I	Friday.
9th	Jumādī I	Monday.
14th	Jumādī I	Saturday.

All of these dates bring us to Monday as the 30th or last day of Jumādī I and to Tuesday as the 1st of Jumādī II.

Consequently, Saturday was the 12th and not the 13th of that month—a fact which has escaped the notice of both Erskine and Dowson" (Indian Eras. Preface, p. XI).

This is all correct so far as it goes; but there is another important date which Cunningham has overlooked. It is that though the 14th of

Jumādī I was a Saturday, the 22nd a Sunday and the 23rd a Monday (*Tūzuk-i-Bāburī*, Pers. Trans. 206 = 208; B. N. 551), the 9th of the second Jumādī is recorded as a *Tuesday*.

Of course, if the 9th Jumādī II was a Tuesday, the 13th must have been a Saturday. This means that the 1st of Jumādī II was not, as Cunningham takes for granted, a Tuesday, but a Monday. The last day of the first Jumādī was not the 30th but the 29th. In other words, the book-rule about 30 days being reckoned to the first Jumādī was disregarded and 29 days only were allowed to it, because the Moon had been seen on the evening which we relate to Sunday and the Muhammadans to Monday.

The fact is that Bābur has given the week-day correctly. It *was* a Saturday, according to *Rūyyat*, because Jumādī I, 933 H. had only 29 days.

Mrs. Beveridge also complains that "there is singular variation between the *Bāburnāma* and Wüstenfeld's Tables, both as to the day of the week on which months began and as to the length of some months. × × × In eight of the months, the Bāburnāma reverses the 'book-rule' of alternative Muharram 30 days, Safar 29 days *et seqq.*" (*B. N.* Tr. LXXI-2). The explanation is that the Emperor's dating is in accordance with the *Rūyyat* system, in which "it sometimes occurs that four successive months are of thirty days and three of twenty-nine" (*Āin.* Tr Jarrett. II. 27). The subject is discussed more fully in my Historical Studies in Mughal Numismatics 257–260.

IV. 274, *l.* 18. *On Monday, the 14th of the first Rabī', I set out in pursuance of a holy war against Chanderī, and marching three Kos, halted at Jalesar.*

Mrs. Beveridge notes that "this cannot be Jalesar in Etah, as it is too far away," and admits her inability to identify it. As it was only three *Kos* or about six miles distant from Āgra, Jalesar in Etah which is about fifty miles north-east may be ruled out. *Perhaps*, this 'Jalesar' is *Chhalesar*, "a village in the south-west of *tahsīl* I'timādpūr. It lies six miles north-east of Āgra and eight miles west from I'timādpūr. It was of some importance under the Mughals, a trace of whose rule remains in the ruined *sarāī* known as Sarāī Begam" (Statistical Account of the North-Western Provinces, 1884, Vol. vii, 721). Thornton mentions it as 'Chuleysur' and says it lies on the road from Āgra to Mynpooree, seven miles north-east of the former, Lat. 27°-13′ N., Long. 87°-10′ E.

IV. 287, *l*. 2. *We halted hard by a village named Jalesar, in the pargana of Sikrī, on the banks of the river Sarū.*

This Jalesar is 'Chaksar', a village in the *pargana* of Sagrī in A'ẓamgarh district. Sagrī was a *maḥāl* in Akbar's *Sarkār* of Jaunpūr (*Āīn*. II. Tr. II. 163). The *pargana* town is shown in Constable Pl. 28 c. b.

IV. 291, *l*. 8 from foot. *The royal lieutenants crossed the Jumnā......... on Sunday, the 8th Jumāda-l-āḳhir (932 H.).*

Correctly, 18th as in Bābur's own Memoirs, (B. N. Tr. 467; E. D. IV. 250. *Tūzuk-i-Bāburī* Pers. Trans. 173, *l*. 8). 8th Jumādī II. 932 H. was Thursday, 22nd March 1526. The 18th was Sunday, 1st April 1526 (Ind. Ephem.). Shaikh Zainī or the copyist has mixed up هشتم with هژدهم.

IV. 295, *l*. 5 from foot. *He [Naqīb Khān] was the translator of the Mahā-bhārata.......... This honour is usually ascribed to Faizī, but I doubt if he had any concern in it beyond the mere general supervision.*

Naqīb Khān was only one of several scholars who were employed in this compilation. The British Museum possesses a manuscript in which he explicitly states that the portion assigned to him—*Parvans* XII to XVIII—was completed by him in Sha'bān 992 H. (Rieu, Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts I. 57). Budāūnī who was one of the 'translators' informs us that Mullā Sherī and Sulṭān Ḥājjī Thānesarī were also employed. He had inside knowledge of the matter and he clearly defines and indicates the very small extent of Faiẓī's share in the work. He states that when the first draft was completed, "Shaikh Faiẓī was directed to convert the rough translation into elegant prose and verse, but he did not complete more than two sections. The aforesaid Ḥājjī then revised those two sections, put right the defects in the first edition, supplied the omissions and comparing it word for word with the original, brought it to such a point of perfection that not a fly-mark of the original was omitted (Tr. Lowe, II. 330; Text II. 321). It seems clear that Faiẓī merely polished up the style of only two sections. "A manuscript containing the first *Parvan* of this more elegant and poetical version of Faiẓī" is in the India Office Library and the date is 1st Rabī' I, 997 H. (Ethe's Catalogue MS. No. 3014). There is a copy also in the Bodleian (Col. 812; MS. No. 1313).

IV. 308, *l*. 12. *Ibrāhīm Khān Sūr............came.........from a place called Shargarī,......a ridge, a spur of the Sulaimān mountains, ...situated on the banks of the Gumāl.*

Prof. Qānūngo thinks that this ʻShargarī' must be ʻSurgurgai' near Āb-i-Istādeh in Afghānistān, Lat. 33°–5′ N., Long. 69°–2′ E. (Sher Shah, p. 2 note). But this does not seem to be *quite* correct, as Āb-i-Istādeh is (approximately) in Lat. 32°–30′ N., Long. 68°– E. or about eighty miles to the south-west of Surgurgai as measured on the map in Constable, Pl. 24. The assertion or rather assumption that the proximity of Surgurgai to the Gumāl Pass was of special advantage to Ibrāhīm for his profession of horse-dealer is also open to challenge, as the Gumāl Pass is almost exactly in Lat. 32°–N., Long. 70°–E., *i. e.* about 100 miles to the south-east of Surgurgai as measured on the map. The spelling of the name itself is quite uncertain, as Tassy reads it as ʻJāzī' (French Trans. p. 6) and other variants ʻZagharī' and ʻZhagharī' are pointed out in Dowson's footnote.

IV. 310, *l.* 13 from foot. *Jamāl Khān......gave him [Hasan Khān] in jāgīr the parganas of Sahsarām Hājīpūr and Tānda, near Banāras.*

Here, Hājīpūr حاجيپور must be a copyist's error for Khāṣpūr خاصپور. See T. A. Lith. 223, *l.* 2. Hājīpūr was at this time in the kingdom of Bengal and ruled over by its independent Sulṭāns. ʻAbbās himself tells us that Makhdūm-i-ʻĀlam, its governor in or about 929 H. was the brother-in-law and servant of Nuṣrat Shāh or Nasīb Shāh of Bengal (E. D. IV. 333). Sahsarām, Khāṣpūr and Tānda must have been then under the Lodī Sulṭāns.

IV. 313, *l.* 13. *Accordingly,......he fixed the payments for measuring the fields (jarībāna) and the fees for the tax-collectors and measurers (Muhassilāna).*

A *Muḥaṣṣil* was, according to Francis Gladwin, "a peon placed over a person as a restraint, to prevent his escape, to enforce the payment of a demand." Bengal Revenue Accounts, 1796, p. 120. He was a sort of bailiff, and not a ʻmeasurer'.

IV. 346, *l.* 10 from foot. *He [Sher Khān] inherited sixty mans of gold from Gūhar Kusāin, widow of Nasīr Khān (Recte, Gusāinī).*

One of Jahāngīr's wives was named Jagat Gosāinī. She was the daughter of the Moṭā Rājā or Udaya Sinha, the Rājā of Jodhpūr and the mother of Prince Khurram (*Tūzuk-i-Jahāngīrī*, ʻAlīgarh Text, 8, *l.* 11 from foot, Tr. I. 19). Sir Jadu Nath Sarkar's interpretation of the name, ʻFemale Pope of the World' (Mughal Administration, Ed.

1924, p. 154) is too fanciful to require serious animadversion. 'Gosāinī' still forms a very common suffix in the names of females of a good family in Rājputāna and elsewhere. Like other suffixes of the same sort, Devī, Kumārī, Lakshmī, etc. it has long since ceased to have any meaning and is applicable to all respectable females.

IV. 349 foot note. *I concur with Elphinstone (History of India Vol. II. 128) in considering this march to have commenced in Safar 944 H. (July 1537 A. D.)*

This footnote is misplaced. It should be printed, not on this page, but on p. 357 as the march which commenced on 15th Ṣafar 944 H. was the one which was undertaken for and ended in the second siege and conquest of Chunār and not this expedition against Sulṭān Maḥmūd Lodī. This will become clear from Elphinstone's own note. "The Memoirs of Humayun", he writes, "say that the army reached Chunār on the Shab-i-Barāt (Sha'bān 15th) of A. H. 945, January 1539; but this would leave only six months for the conquest of Bengal, and all the other operations till Humāyūn's defeat in Ṣafar A. H. 946 (June 1539). I conclude, therefore, that the memoir-writer, who scarcely ever gives a date, may have mistaken the year, although he has remembered the festival, and that the siege began on 15th Sha'bān A. H. 944 (January 8th, 1538). All accounts agree that the siege lasted several months, some say six months" (Ed. 1866, pp. 446–7, note). This leaves no room for doubt on the matter. 15th Sha'bān 944 H. was the day on which Humāyūn started for the final siege of Chunār, not for the battle with the Lodī Sulṭān, to which this passage refers. That battle was fought in 939 H.

The date of the second siege of Chunār is given wrongly by Jauhar (Tr. Stewart, Reprint. 12) as 945 H. and by Niẓāmu-d-dīn as 942 H. (Ṭ. A. Lith. 200, *l*. 4). Elliot writes as if Elphinstone was the first to indicate or discover the true year and speaks elsewhere also (p. 359 note) of 944 H. as 'Elphinstone's date." This is not correct. Firishta, that highly-esteemed writer, had anticipated long ago and stated clearly that Humāyūn left Āgra for laying siege to Chunār on the 18th of Ṣafar 944 H. The year is specified in words as well as in figures (I. 216, *l*. 10 from foot). Elphinstone is wrong in stating that Firishta gives the year as 943 H. (H. I. 444 note).

IV. 355 last line. *Sher Khān......... attacked the Kingdom of Bengal, and got possession of all of it on this side Gharī (Sikrīgalī).*

This Garhī is also called Teliāgarhī and the latter name is supposed to be derived from an individual of the Telī or oilman caste who is said to have been made Rājā of the district by the favour of the goddess Kālī (A. N. Tr. III. 151 Note; Imp. Gaz. *s. v.* Teliāgarhī).

Elphinstone speaks of it as 'Sicragallī' (Ed. 1866, pp. 446–7), and in his parenthetical gloss as well as in a note on p. 367, Dowson says that that Garhī is "better known as Sicly-gully, properly Sankrī-galī." Other European writers commit the same error and Thornton makes no mention of Garhī at all, though he notices Sikreegulee as "a difficult pass where the Rājmahāl hills close upon the river" Ganges in Lat. 25°-10′ N., Long. 87°-43′ E. As a matter of fact, there are two places or passes which though in proximity to each other, are quite distinct. They are shown separately in the map accompanying Mr. C. E. A. W. Oldham's article on 'Routes New and Old' in 'Bengal Past and Present for 1934.' Sikrīgallī is nine or ten miles to the east of Teliāgarhī. It is now a station on the East Indian Railway, about five miles from Ṣāhibganj. The ruins of the old fort which blocked the mouth of the defile of Teliāgarhī can be still traced. Sicrīgallī does not appear to have had any fort. Teliāgarhī is shown in the I. G. Atlas, Pl. 29 C a. Jauhar explicitly speaks of "the strong passes of Terryagurhy and 'Sikryagurhi' and distinguishes between them (Trans. Reprint, 1904, p. 16).

IV. 359, foot note. *Elphinstone's date of 15th Sha'bān 944 (8th January, 1538) for the commencement of the siege (of Chunār) is the most probable one.*

The correct Julian correspondence of 15th Sha'bān 944 is 17–18th January 1538. Elphinstone gave it wrongly and his error has been re-iterated not only by Elliot, but also in our own times by Dr. Qānūngo (Sher Shah, p. 145 note, 158 note).

IV. 362, foot note line 6. *It is odd that a white elephant should have been called syām (black) Chandar.*

But in the Bibl. Ind. text of the *Tārīkh-i-Salāṭīn-i-Afāghana*, from which this story is quoted, the name of the beast is 'Shyām Sundar' (191, *l.* 4; 193, *l.* 9).

White elephants are not really 'white', but of a dull, ashy or earthy colour (Barbosa, Tr. Dames. II. note). 'Shyām Sundar' would mean 'The *Beautiful* Black One', 'The Handsome Darky'. Elsewhere also, Aḥmad Yādgār speaks of the Rājā of Gwāliār possessing an ele-

phant of the same name (84, *l.* 5). Shyāmsundar is one of the many epithets of the Demi-god Kṛishṇa and 'Shyāmsundar Dās' is a common personal name among Hindus.

IV. 365, *l.* 3. *Mūyid Beg......and Jahāngīr Kulī, son of Ibrāhīm Bāyazīd, Mīr Nūrka......were ordered to march.*

I have suggested (S. I. M. H. Vol I, 453) that Mīr Nūrka may be an error for 'Mīr Nūr Beg'; but Nūr Beg is never called 'Mīr' by Bābur and the individual referred to here must be, I now think, 'Mīr Būzka'. The name is spelt as بیجکه بوجکه بیجکه and بوزکه. So نورکه looks like a perversion of بوزکه with the dots transposed. Mīr Būzka was one of Bābur's braves and is frequently mentioned in his Memoirs (B. N. Tr. 458, 534, 545, 546–7). He was one of the *Khāṣa-tābīn* (*Ibid.* 474). He was afterwards given the title of Bahādur and Jauhar tells us that 'Myr Bejka Bahādur' was killed along with Bābā Beg and Kūch Beg in defending Humāyūn's queen, Bega or Ḥājjī Begam after the flight of the Mughals at Chausa (Tr. Stewart, Reprint, 25; E. D. V. 142).

Abū-l-Faẓl states in the counterpart passage that His Majesty (Humāyūn) sent from Bhāgalpūr, Ibrāhīm Beg Chāpuk, Jahāngīr Qulī Beg, Bairām Beg, Nahāl Beg, Roshan Beg, Gurg 'Alī Beg and *Bachka* Bahādur with a large force" (A. N. I. 152; Tr. I. 334). He is mentioned in three other places also in the A. N. On I. 131 = Tr. I. 301, he is called 'Bachaka Bahādur, on I. 149 = Tr. I. 330, he is spoken of as 'Būchka Beg' and on I. 141 = Tr. I. 317, he is styled *Mīr* Būchka. This settles the point.

IV. 365, *l.* 7 from foot. *When Sher Khān had crossed the defile of Gharī, he saw Saif Khān Acha-Khail Sarwānī, who was taking his family to Rohtās.*

There is some mistake here. This Gharī cannot possibly be Garhī or Telīagarhī, the 'Gate of Bengal'. It is abundantly clear that Sher Khān was, at this time, going from some place in Bihār to Rhotās by way of Maner and Monghyr and that Gūgarghar (or Kūkargarh, Dog's Fort ?), where Saif Khān encountered the pursuing Mughals, lay somewhere to the south west of Monghyr. Tassy leaves out the name altogether and merely states that "Sher Khān sallied out of the pass (*endroit*) where he was and met Saif Khān who was conducting his family to Rhotās" (p. 85). The word seems to be used here as a common noun in the sense of 'fort at the mouth of a pass.'

IV. 367, *l*. 3. *When Sher Khān arrived at Mūngīr, where Shujā'at Khān Nīāzī was, he ordered him......to take Saif Khān's family to the fort of Gharī.*

Tassy calls the last place 'Kadhūr' (p. 87) and this may be the correct name. The place meant may be Gidhaur, which lies about fifty miles south-west of Monghyr. Constable, Pl. 29 B. C. In any case, it cannot be Garhī or Teliāgarhī.

IV. 375, last line. *He then performed a special ablution and returned two-fold thanks to the Lord of Eternity* [*for his victory over Humāyūn*].

'He went through the thanks-giving service or prayer, which is called دوگانه because there are two *Rak'ats* in it. Rak'at literally means 'genuflexion', but the word is really used for the combined performance of several different ceremonies, (kneeling, standing erect or prostration and the recitation of several prayers in a prescribed form). See Herklots, Qānoon-e-Islām, Edit. 1863, p. 53; Sell, Faith of Islam, 259-63. Khwāfī Khān tells us that when Aurangzeb defeated his brother Shujā' near Khajwa, he went through the *Dogāna-i-Shukr* ادای دوگانهٔ شکر (*Muntakhabu-l-Lubāb*, II. 59, *l*. 6). Elsewhere he states that when Shambhājī and Kabkalas were brought in chains before him, he descended from the throne and went through two *Rak'ats* of thanks-giving. از بالای تخت فرود آمده دو رکعت شکرانه ادا نمودند (*Ibid*. II. 388, *l*. 7). Baranī informs us that Sulṭān Fīrūz Tughlaq بر شکر استجابت دعا دو... رکعت نماز گزارد (T. F. 591, *l*. 5 from foot), when Shamsu-d-dīn Ilyās of Bengal turned out of Ikdāla to engage in battle and that after routing him he دوگانهای شکر فتح میگذارد ند (Ib. 594, *l*. 6 from foot).

IV. 379, *l*. 10 from foot. *Kutb Khān went from Chanderi to the city of Chondha, and engaging the Mughals at Chondha, was slain.*

As Abū-l-Fazl (A. N. I. 161 = Tr. I. 346), Ṭ. A. (Lith. 202, *l*. 9) and Mirzā Haidar (T. R. Tr. 472) put the engagement near Kālpī, this Chondha may be Seondhā, now in Datiā state. It lies about forty miles west of Kālpī. Chanderī is about a hundred miles to the south of Seondhā and Quṭb Khān was encountered and slain when he was returning from Chanderī. This Seondhā is in Lat. 26°-9′ N., Long. 78°-49′ E., I. G. Atlas, Pl. 38 C. 1. There is a Seondha in Bāndā

district also. It is situated about 30 miles north-west of Kālinjar on the river Ken (Constable's Atlas, Pl. 28 B. C.) in Lat. 25°-27′ N., Long. 83°-24′ E. 'Kālpī' and *Sanahda* and 'Gurra' are mentioned in juxtaposition in Sikandar Lodī's rent-roll (*Tūzuk-i-Bāburī* in E. D. IV. 262 note). Mrs. Beveridge reads the second name as 'Sehonda' or 'Seondhā' (B. N. 521).

IV. 383, *l.* 5. (*Sher Shāh*) *sent Barmazīd Gūr* (*in pursuit of Humāyūn*).

I have shown in the note in S. I. M. H. Vol. I, 457, that 'Barmazīd' and 'Mazīd' are not uncommon names among Afghāns and Turks. In addition to the examples cited there, I may now refer to several instances of their occurrence in the *Tārīkh-i-Rashīdī* of Mirzā Ḥaidar. Barmazīd Mankish was one of the braves of Sulṭān Sa'īd Khān of Kāshgar (Tr. Ney Elias and Ross, 309). Muḥammad Mazīd Tarkhān was governor of Turkestān (*Ibid.* 118). Another man called Mazīd is mentioned at pp. 380, 383 and the name Mīr Mazīd arrests attention at pp. 241, 308, 356, 357 and 403 note. But I was unable then to suggest any explanation of the sobriquet of the Barmazīd of 'Abbās. I now think that it should be pronounced 'Kūr' and not 'Gūr', and that it means 'one-eyed'. I am indebted for this idea to Budāūnī who states that Islām Shāh Sūr sent to the dungeons of Gwāliār "Quṭb Khān, Shāhbāz Lohānī, × × × × Barmazīd Kūr, *who was the Dajjāl of that sect and the Ḥajjāj of his age*, and thirteen or fourteen other *amīrs*" (Tr. Ranking, I. 490). The words in the original are برمزید کورکر دجال این امت وحجاج روزگار خود بود

B. I. text, I. 379, *l.* 2.

The question we have to answer is why is Barmazīd compared here to these fiends in human form? The reply is, because he was one-eyed and because he was a horrid ruffian who was notorious for his massacres and blood-lust. Dajjāl, the false Christ مسیح الکذاب is described in the *Qurān* as a monster whose right eye is blind and who will, during the days of his ascendancy, doom to death and destruction millions of human beings (Alberūnī, *Āthār-al-Bāqiya*, Trans. E. Sachau, 195-6). Ḥajjāj, also is the typical mass-murderer and persecutor of Islamic history. Barmazīd appears to have acquired an evil reputation for barbarous and remorseless cruelty. The *Makhzan-i-Afghānī* gives the following instance of his exploits in this direction.

"Barmazīd Gūr was sent to pursue Humāyūn after the battle of Kanoj. When he reached Āgra and entered the town after Humāyūn

had fled from it, he put a vast number of Moguls residing there to the sword. This cruel deed was entirely disapproved of by Sheer Shāh, who severely reprimanded the author" (Tr. Dorn. I, 128).

Elsewhere, Ni'matullāh tells a story which illustrates the fact that Khawāṣṣ Khān's humanity and kindliness were as well known to Sher Shāh, as the blood-lust of Barmazīd and his readiness to become a willing tool in any butchery or deed of stony-hearted savagery (*Ibid.* II, 108).

The anecdote is too long to quote in full, but its purport will bear repetition, as it is not only germane to the matter in hand, but *throws revealing light on the true character of the* Sūrī Sulṭān. Sher Shāh once sent for Barmazīd as well as Khawāṣṣ Khān and spoke to the first, thus : "Whenever I shall send to thee a guilty person, however little he may be deserving of death, consider it without further inquiry as certain that I send him to be removed from the area of life to the punishment of death, and so put him to death at once." He then turned to Khawāṣṣ Khān and said, "Any person, however guilty and deserving of capital punishment, whom I shall send to thee, know that he has been pardoned, and I leave it to thy option to set him at liberty without further inquiry." The story speaks for itself and goes far towards explaining why Budāūnī stigmatises him as the Dajjāl of the Sūrīs and the Ḥajjāj of his age

'Kūr' is not always applied to a man who has totally lost his sight, but is also used for the one-eyed man The *Ghiyāṣu-l-Lughāt* gives کور یک چشم as the Persian equivalent of the Arabic احول. This sobriquet is associated with the names of several other persons also, *e. g.* Mīr Ḥusain Kūr, 'Īdī Kūr, Maqṣūd 'Alī Kūr and Shihābu-d-dīn Kūr (E. D. III. 404; A. N. text III. 298, 304, 611 = Trans. III. 441, 450, 935).

The names of all these men occur in connection with active military operations or revolts and acts of violence. None of them could have been absolutely sightless. In any case, it is certain that Maqṣūd 'Alī *Kūr* was not blind, but only one-eyed. He was one of those who were sent to capture Gwāliār in 965 H. (T. A. B. I. Text II. 140, *l.* 21 = E. D. V. 295). When he was afterwards employed under I'timād Khān, the governor of Bhakkar, there was a violent altercation between them about money matters and "Maqṣūd 'Alī *who was blind of one eye,*

represented his poverty to I'timād. The latter told him that he deserved to have his blind eye pissed upon.

اعتماد خان برهم شده گفت کر برچشم کور تو باید شاشید

Then Maqṣūd drew his dagger and killed him" (*Maāṣiru-l-Umarā*, I. 90, *l.* 8; Ma'ṣūm, *Tārīkh-i-Sind* 247, *l.* 17 = E. D. I. 244; A. N. III. 249 = Tr. III. 359 and note; *Āīn.* Tr. I. Reprint, p. 473).

There can be little doubt that none of these four men was really blind. Mention is also made in the histories of Ḥamza Beg 'Abdullāh who was generally known as 'Kūr Ḥamza' and had been an old servant of the father of Rustam Mirzā Safavī. When the young prince was appointed governor of Zamīndāwar, by Sulṭān Muḥammad Khudā-banda, 'Kūr Ḥamza' was appointed as the *Wakīl* or guardian of Mirzā Rustam and his minor brothers and accompanied them (*Āīn.* Tr. Reprint, I, 327). A blind guardian of young boys is simply unthinkable and we may be sure that this man whose intrigues and arbitrary behaviour are said to have provoked war and forced the eldest brother Muẓaffar Ḥusain to get rid of him by murder was blind of only one eye. Still another man with the same nick-name Mīrak *Kūr* is noticed by Bābur as the *Dīwān* or minister of Badī'u-z-zamān Mirzā (B. N. Tr. 328 *Tūzuk*, Pers. Trans. 130). We also learn that Karīmdād, the youngest son of Jalāl, the Tārīkī was also called کور and had this identical epithet appended to his name, although there is nothing to show and it is not likely that he was blind of both eyes. He was put up in 1047 H. (1637–8 A. C.) as their leader by the rump of these turbulent schismatics, but ultimately hunted down and beheaded by Sa'īd Khān, the governor of Kābul (*Bādshāh-nāma*, I. 317; M. U. II. 247–248).

IV. 383, *l.* 10. *The Emperor Humāyūn on reaching Āgra, told Amīr Saiyed Amīru-d-dīn, that the Afghāns had not defeated his soldiers, but that he had seen supernatural beings fighting his soldiers and turning back their horses.*

This extraordinary story is repeated by Aḥmad Yādgār (204, *l.* 9) and also in *Makhzan* (Dorn. I. 128). Humāyūn was not romancing or handling the truth carelessly. He was only labouring under a hallucination. It is not uncommon for the human mind to play very extraordinary antics with neurotic and impressionable individuals under conditions of great strain or stress. The Arabian prophet is said to have seen angels dressed in green, fighting on his side in the battle of Bedr (Muir, Life of Mahomet, Ed. 1894, p. 227; Quran, *Sūras* III and VIII).

Several similar incidents are reported in the chronicles of the Crusades and of the Wars between the English and the Scots. There is also the instance of what is known to the historians of the Great War of 1914–18 as 'the phenomenon of the Angels of Mons.' When the British troops were at one time driven back in the disastrous battle of Mons, the tide of battle is said to have been stemmed by angelic hosts who had come to the rescue and were said to have been seen by the English soldiers. Budāūnī says that on the last day of Sher Shāh's siege of Kālinjar, "a report became current that certain men from the invisible world had come to the aid of the Muslims" and that many soldiers in the trenches saw several horsemen "armed cap-a-pie" and "clothed from head to foot in black", who kept "advancing in front till they entered the fort and vanished" (Text, I. 372–3 = Tr. I. 483).

IV. 391, *l.* 9. *And he [Sher Shāh] made Kāzī Fazīlat, better known as Kāzī Fazīhat, manager (amīr) of Bengal.*

Here again, *amīn* امین has been wrongly read as 'amīr'. He was a sort of Chief Commissioner or General referee and umpire who was to settle disputes between the *shiqdārs* or divisional officers about limits of jurisdiction, extent of authority etc. His duties are not defined by 'Abbās and are conjecturally described in such vague and ambiguous terms that it seems infructuous to wrangle about the matter.

The *raison d'etre* of the Qāzī's nickname is obscure and the vilificatory turn or twist given to the original name becomes all the more inexplicable as Niẓāmu-d-dīn (Ṭ. A. Lith. 231, *l.* 1) and Firishta speak of him as a learned man renowned for his integrity and conscientious performance of duty [دیانت و امانت]. A clue is perhaps furnished by Budāūnī who says here (I. 365, *l.* 3 = Tr. 474) that he was *appropriately* [اسم با مسمی] styled Qāẓī *Faẓīhat* and explains elsewhere (III. 101 = Tr. II. 104) that "he was never at a loss for good sayings and jokes." This may mean that the Qāẓī's wit was somewhat Rabelaisian in character and that good people looked upon a Muslim divine whose 'quips and cranks' and more or less indecorous pleasantries were in everybody's mouth as "a scandal to his cloth" and his order.

IV 396, *l.* 6 from foot. *When Sher Shāh heard this intelligence, he called Hājī Khān to his own presence from Māndū and bestowed on him the command of 12000 horse and gave to Shujā'at Khān Ujjain, Māndū, Sārangpūr and Man(da)-sūr in Jāgīr.*

There is some blundering here. The command of 12000 horse and the *jāgīr* were both conferred on Shujā'at Khān, as a reward for the prowess and intrepid loyalty he had displayed in the battle with Nāṣir Khān and the subsequent succour of Ḥājjī Khān. When Mallū Khān contrived to make his escape from the custody of Shujā'at, the latter was degraded and deprived of the viceroyalty of the entire province of Māndū, and given only the districts of Hindīā and Satwās, equal to the maintenance of only 4000 horse (E. D. IV. 395). He was now restored to favour and promoted and given a command of 12000 horse and an adequate *jāgīr*. Tassy understands it rightly and says that Sher Shāh entrusted the command of 12000 horse to Shujā'at Khān and bestowed *all* the four districts mentioned in *jāgīr* (p. 124). Dorn also says much the same (I. 134) and the T. A. roundly states that the governorship (حکومت) of Mālwā was taken away from Ḥājjī Khān and assigned to Shujā'at Khān (Lith. 231, *l.* 8, B. I. text II. 103, *l.* 9). The story told by 'Abbās at pp. 406 7 also shows that Shujā'at was in command of 12000 horse and answerable to Sher Shāh for their adequate remuneration and maintenance.

IV. 397, *l.* 4 from foot. *A report came from Khawās Khān that enmity had broken out between him and Haibat Khān, and requesting him to send for a representative of each of them.*

Dorn puts the latter part of the sentence differently thus: "but that by recalling either of them, the welfare of the empire would be preserved" (I. 134). Cf. also Tassy. 125. The fact that Sher Shāh is said to have recalled 'Īsā Khān and Ḥabīb Khān and "confirmed Ḥaibat Khān in the government of the Punjab" indicates that this is the true meaning.

IV. 398, last line. *In the night, Hindū Balūch with 300 men came out of the mud fort and attacking the besiegers fiercely, cut their way through by their valour. When it was day, the Afghāns occupied the fort.........and they took Hindū Balūch and Bakshū Sangah prisoners.*

There is an apparent inconsistency or error here. Hindū (*variants* 'Mandū' or 'Meedoo') Balūch could not have cut his way through at night and also have been taken prisoner in the morning. The *Makhzan-i-Afghānī* states that "during the night, a Bellochian Omra Meedoo by name, found means, with his servant, whose name was Said, to leave the army, and carry the news of Futh Khan's

imprisonment to the garrison of the citadel; but, in spite of his efforts to save it by resuming the defence, he was forced on the second day to surrender. × × × Meedoo himself was seized by Bukshoo Lunga and delivered alive to Hybet Khan." (Dorn. I. 135).

There had been a deadly and long standing feud between the Langahs and the Balūch and Bakhshū had offered to assist Ḥaibat Khān. It is nonsense to say that Ḥaibat "wrote letters to Sher Shāh reporting the capture of Fatḥ Khān, Hindu Balūch *and* Bakshū Langāh" (p. 399, *l.* 9). What he did was to announce the capture of Hindū Balūch *by* Bakhshū. Tassy also speaks of the capture of *Mandū* Balūch by Bakhshū (p. 126), though other parts of the passage have been imperfectly understood by him. 'Mando' and not 'Hindu' is most probably the correct form of the name. A Mando Khān Rind is said to have followed Bijār Khān, when the latter separated from Mīr Chākar and migrated to the east of the Indus from Sībī or Sewīstān (Baluchistan District Gazetteer, Ed. 1907, III. Text p. 271). 'Rind' is the designation of a Balūch tribe.

IV. 403, *l.* 12. *He made over the fort of Rāisīn to Munshī Shāhbāz Khān Acha-Khail Sarwānī.*

It is not easy to understand why this man is called 'Munshī'. Ni'matullāh drops the prefix and speaks of him as 'Shāhbāz Khān, a son of Yūsuf Khan Atcha Khail', that is, of the man who is called 'Saif Khān Acha-Khail Sarwānī' by Dowson on p. 365 (Dorn. I. 138). 'Yūsuf' is only a variant of 'Saif' (*Ibid.* 113). The name of the new castellan is given as 'Shihāb Khān Raja Khail Sānī' by Tassy (p. 131). 'Raja' and 'Sani' are manifest errors for 'Acha' and 'Sarwānī.'

IV. 404, *l.* 14. *I have heard from......the Khān A'zam and of Muzaffar Khān.*

Delete 'and of'. Khān-i-A'ẓam was the title of this Muẓaffar Khān. See pp. 386 and 422 of this volume where also he is mentioned. He was the father-in-law of 'Abbās Khān Sarwānī and son of Jalāl Khān, son of Ḥaibat Khān, son of 'Umar Khān Sarwānī Kakbūr (*Ibid.* 347).

IV. 405, *l.* 12. *When he approached the enemy, Shīr Khān contrived a stratagem and having written letters in the name of Māldeo's nobles to this effect, viz.......'During the battle, we will seize Māldeo and bring him to you'.*

Sher Shāh is said to have acquired a liking for history and the lives of ancient kings when he was at school in Jaunpūr ('Abbās in

E. D. IV. 311) and it is not unlikely that this ruse or stratagem was suggested to him by a story told of Sulṭān Ibrāhīm Ghaznavī by Ibna-l-Athīr (Bulāq Edit. X, 57, *l.* 19). Firishta has lifted it from the older author and relates it thus: "Mullik Shāh Suljooky having evinced an intention to invade Ghizny, × × × Ibrahīm adopted the following scheme. He wrote letters to the principal chiefs of Mullik Shāh's army. × × The purport of these letters was to importune the chiefs to whom they were directed to hasten the king's march to Ghizny, lest their plans should be prematurely discovered, and that they might depend upon his fulfilling his engagements to their satisfaction." The messenger was instructed to proceed in such a way that he could not fail to be arrested by the guards of Malik Shāh and the letters to fall into his hands. When that king read the letters, they "excited such suspicion in his mind that he, from that time, was desirous of peace and abandoned his expedition." Briggs' Trans. (Reprint 1908, I. 138-9; Firishta, Lith. I. 48, *l.* 14).

IV. 406, *l.* 8. *Khawās Khān founded a city in his own name near the fort of Jūdhpūr and called it "Khawāspūr".*

This place is mentioned in Dowson's extracts from the *Tārīkh-i-Dāudī* (p. 502) also and is still in existence. I am informed that it lies about 44 miles north-east of Jodhpur town.

Another memorial of the Sūrī Sulṭān's devastating invasion of Mārwār is to be found in Shergarh, which is situated about forty miles due west of Jodhpūr. It is marked in Constable Pl. 27 A b.

IV. 408, *l.* 8. *Shaikh Khalīl, Shaikh Niẓām and other learned men and most of the others escaped and were not burnt.*

The Ṭ. A. (Lith. 232, *l.* 15) and F. (I. 228, *l.* 17) put it just the other way and state that these two Shaikhs and Daryā Khān Sarwānī were burnt سوختند. Perhaps the meaning is that they were hurt but not with fatal results. According to the *Makhzan*, Shaikh Khalīl and Shaikh Niẓām came to inquire after his health soon "after Sher Shāh was carried away half-burned to his tent. Besides him, there were fifteen men burned who had stood at the same place", but these two were apparently not among the number (Dorn. I. 141).

IV. 415, *l.* 4. *Haibat Khān Niāzī......had one force consisting of thirty thousand horsemen in the neighbourhood of the fort of Rohtās etc.*

The account which follows of the chief strategic points in Sher Shāh's empire is sufficiently impressive and does justice to its great

extent. But Prof. Qānūngo complains that a large and important province has been left out. "All historians", he writes, "have omitted to mention the Afghān conquest of Sind, which was also, in all probability, achieved by Ḥaibat Khān. Two coins of Sher Shāh are extant in the Indian Museum, Calcutta, coined respectively in 950 H. and 951 H. from the mint town ‘Shergadh *urf* Sakkar Bakkar’ (See pp. 84–109 Catalogue of Coins, Indian Museum Vol. II by H. N. Wright). The importance of this numismatic discovery cannot be overestimated. The most minute research in old MSS could have perhaps never given us this piece of information. ‘Abbās, Niẓāmu-d-dīn, Budāūnī and Abū-l-Faẓl are silent about it" (Sher Shah, p. 313).

There are far too many gaps in our knowledge of the history of Musalman rule in India and every effort to bridge them must be welcome, but this is surely neither the correct, nor even the fair way of accomplishing the object.

These coins were not struck at Sakkar-Bakkar and Sakkar is an unwarranted interpolation. The real name is Shergadh *urf Shiqq-i-Bakkar* شیرگده عرف شق بکر . Mr. Nelson Wright read the mint name upon them (nos. 648–650) as well as upon the similar issues of Islām Shāh (Nos. 798–799 a) in that way and no other. In a much later work on the Coinage and Metrology of the Sulṭāns of Dehlī also, the third word is always read شق on the coins of all the three Sūrīs (Nos. 1049–1051, 1295–1302 and 1434 F.).

There is nothing whatever to show that this Bakkar was the place of that name near Rohrī in Sind and Mr. Wright himself does not say a word anywhere in either of his works, which would lead any one to think so. The idea of reading the third word as ‘Sakkar’ does not appear to have ever occurred even in imagination to him and it may be permissible to stress the matter here as he is no longer alive to repudiate the fantastic suggestion which has been put forward in his name and fathered upon him.

It is not easy to say where this Shergaḍh *urf* Shiqq-i-Bakkar was. It may be the Shergaḍh, which is said to have been founded by Fatḥ Jang Khān "in the country of Multān", after the Bilūchīs who had laid it waste had been crushed and their leaders Fatḥ Khān Jāṭ and Mando Bilūch put to death. There is a ‘Bhakkar’ in Miānwalī district, Panjab, which lies about fifteen miles south-east of Dērā Ismāīl Khān town (I. G. Atlas. 32 B. 2; Constable's Atlas. 24 D. b.). It may be the place intended, and at any rate, it is a possible alternative.

IV. 415, *l.* 16. *The Sarkār of Sirhind was given in jāgīr to Masnad 'Alī Khawās Khān who kept in that sarkār his slave Malik Bhagvant at the capital Dehlī. Miān Ahmad Khān Sarwānī was Amīr.*

The sentence is wrongly punctuated. The deputy of the *jāgīrdār* of Sirhind could not have had his headquarters at Dehlī. A full stop should be read after Bhagvant and a new sentence should begin with 'At'.

Miān Aḥmad Khān Sarwānī was the 'amīn' (not 'amīr') *at Dehlī* and his subordinates Ḥātim Khān and 'Ādil Khān were, respectively, *shiqqdār* and *faujdār of Dehlī.*

IV. 419, *l.* 3 from foot. *Another fort that of Bohnikundal, he (Sher Shāh) also built, and ordered another to be built in these hills and called it 'Sher Koh'.*

If this 'Sher Koh' is, as appears very probable, an error for 'Shergarh', the fort meant may be that which stands about twenty miles west-south-west of Sāsserām, Lat. 24°-50′ N., Long. 83°-49′ E. (Thornton. 885). گڑہ is very liable to be misread or miswritten as کوہ.

IV. 428, *l.* 13. *Sher Shāh sent his own nephew, Mubāriz Khān to govern the district of Roh.*

This man cannot be identical with Mubāriz Khān, who afterwards sat on the throne as Muḥammad Shāh 'Ādil, as though he also was the son of a brother, he is said to have been slain in this squalid brawl while Sher Shāh was alive. As 'Adil was the son of Sher Shah's full brother Niẓām Khān, and as his sister was the wife of Islām Shāh, his mother was, most probably, a lady of 'pure birth' and not a slave girl. Tassy reads the name as '*Mubārik* Khān' and that may be the correct form.

IV. 433, *l.* 5. *And in the time of Sher Shāh, a decrepit old woman might place a basket of gold ornaments on the head and go on a journey etc.*

I have pointed out that this is only a rhetorical way of describing the maintenance of an ideally perfect system of law and order. Amīr Khusrav writes in praise of the peace and order of 'Alāu-d-dīn's reign : "No one has heard the name of robber, thief or pickpocket (رہزن in the text). Night prowlers who formerly used to set villages on fire now attend to travellers with a lighted lamp. In whatever part of the country a traveller may lose a piece of rope, either the rope is produced or compensation given". *Khazāin*, Tr. Ḥabīb, p. 11; text 19, *l.* 4 from foot.

Abū Turāb Walī exploits the old woman's gold basin in a similarly bombastic and unrealistic panegyric on the perfect security of property and safety of the roads in the reign of Akbar.

مترددین صادر و وارد بخاطر جمع طشت نقره و زر بردوش و بر سر
می آرند و مي برند و از هیچ دزد و حرامي خوف و خطر ندارند

Tārīkh-i-Gujarāt, 90, *l.* 13.

"Travellers go and come with tranquil hearts and bring and carry away trays of silver and gold on their shoulders and their heads and have no fear or dread of robbers or criminals." Sujān Rāi cites the following couplets from some Persian poet.

اگر یک تن برد چون مہر انور - زمشرق تا بمغرب طشت از زر
نیارد ہیچ غور از ورع و پرہیز - کہ در طشت زر او بنگرد تیز

Khulāṣatu-t-Tawārīkh, text, 323, *l.* 3 from foot.

"If any person carries a golden tray, like the glittering sun, from east to west, no other individual will dare to cast a sharp, *i. e.* covetous glance at it on account of being afraid to do wrong and desiring to abstain from evil",

One more quotation will suffice to bring home to the most ardent admirer of Sher Shāh that these panegyrists are not relating a fact, but glibly repeating a colourful catch-phrase or senseless stock expression. It occurs in a Chronicle of the Sulṭāns of Golkonda, written about 1620 A. C., which has been translated by Briggs in his version of Firishta's work. This author, while extolling the virtues and most admirable government of Ibrāhīm Quṭb Shāh, writes thus: "Such was the excellence of his police administration that an old woman might pass with a tray of gold on her head from Golconda to Bengal, to Beejapoor or to Ahmadnagger without fear of molestation" (*op. cit.* III. 446).

IV. 438, *l.* 6. ***Shaikh Hasan, the grandson of the Shaikh Abū Lālā, whose memory is revered in Rāpri.***

This is one of several anecdotes and passages which are common to the Chronicles of ʿAbdullāh and Aḥmad Yādgār. The latter calls the saint ابوالعلی Abū-l-ʿalā (*Tārīkh-i-Salāṭīn-i-Afāghana*, B. I. text, 29, *l.* 7) and this is most probably, the correct name. This Shaikh Hasan is said to have died on 24th Rabīʿ 1 909 H. (*Akhbāru-l-Akhiyār*, p. 187).

IV. 440, *l.* 11 from foot. *Saif Jān.*

In the *Tārīkh-i-Salāṭīn-i-Afāghana* of Aḥmad Yādgār, who has copied this story also from the *Tārīkh-i-Dāūdī*, he is called *Yūsuf* Khān (B. I. text, 31, *l.* 3).

IV. 441, *l.* 8. *The Sultān said 'O Khwājagī, they have given us a strange sort of kingdom'.*

The point of this reply is not very apparent. Aḥmad Yādgār who has copied the story like many other anecdotes from the *Tārīkh-i-Dāūdī* puts it thus : شاهزاده فرمود عجب فرمان بادشاهي آوردى

"The Prince said, 'You have brought me a strange sort of *Farmān* bestowing a kingdom' (or *Farmān* of the emperor). Perhaps the important word فرمان had been missed out by the copyist of the Elliot manuscript.

IV. 451, foot note *l.* 1. *Miān Bhūdh succeeded to the late Khawās Khān and was confirmed in the dignity (of prime minister).*

The name should be pronounced as 'Bhūva' (بهوه) not 'Bhūdh' (بهودھ). Elliot himself speaks of him as 'Miān Bhūa' at E. D. V. 13 and 14. The name is read as 'Bhodā' in the C. H. I. III, 248, but this cannot be right as it seems to be clearly written as 'Bhūa' in the preface to the *Tibb-i-Sikandarī* (Rieu, Persian Catalogue, II. 471, III. 1120. Ethé. I. O. Catalogue, No. 2305, Bodleian Catalogue, No. 1592). The *Wāqi'āt-i-Mushtāqī* (E. D. IV. 544) and Aḥmad Yādgār also (B. I. text. 42, 75, 76) call him میان بهوه. Jahāngīr speaks frequently of a noble who was commonly known as Sayyid *Bhūva* (بهوه) Bukhārī and was Faujdār of Dehlī (T. J. 281, *l.* 22; 282, *l.* 24; 377, *l.* 4; R. B.'s Tr. II. 109, 111, 287, 288). He appears to have had the title of Dīndārkhān and was a Bukhārī Sayyid (*M. U.* II. 23). Budāūnī speaks of a Miān Bhūva Lohānī, who was a governor of Bayāna in the reign of Islām Shāh Sūr (text I. 403, *l.* 7 from foot, 404, *l.* 11 = trans. 518-9).

Niẓāmu-d-dīn Aḥmad tells a story of Shaikh Bhūva and Sulṭān Sikandar Lodī, which is really more intriguing and pregnant with meaning than all the folk-tales and childish stories retailed by Aḥmad Yādgār and others.

One day, he says, the Sulṭān told the minister that he was greatly concerned about and most anxious to uproot the noxious custom of 'Malba' which was destroying the prosperity of the country and depopulating it. Could he not suggest some device for its extermination? The Shaikh's reply was, "It is quite easy to abolish the 'Malba'.

If only Your Majesty will take one end of the *jarīb* (the pole or rope for measuring the area of cultivable land) and give the other end to Your servant, there will be no 'Malba' at all in the land. So long as every individual appointed to any office does not totally cast off greed and cupidity, the 'Malba' will not disappear" (B. I. Text I, 340, *l.* 5 from foot, Lith. 173, *l.* 9).

But what was this pestilent and ineradicable 'Malba'? H. H. Wilson thus explains this obsolete Hindī vocable: "All village expenses met by public assessment; feeding members of the community when on public duty, or religious mendicants; payments to subordinate police and revenue officials; fines imposed for plundered property, when traced within the boundaries of the village; expenses of punchāyats when assembled on business of the village etc." (Glossary of Judicial and Revenue Terms, p. 324).

This 'Malba' still exists in almost every part of India under various names in spite of innumerable enactments, circulars, orders, notices and warnings and will probably continue to do so till the end of time.

IV. 462, *l.* 10 from foot. *Sultān Sikandar returned thence to Darweshpūr, where he stayed some months.*

There is an old village called 'Darbespūr' on the northern side of the road from Dīnāpur to Maner and Arrah. It lies about four miles east of maner. Sikandar appears to have encamped there with his army as it was so close to Maner, which was a place of pilgrimage.

IV. 464, *l.* 11 from foot. *Aʿzam Humāyūn, the governor of that district (Sambhal), sent the Brahman, the Kāẓī Pyārā and Shaikh Badr, all three into the King's presence at Sambhal.*

I have suggested (S. I. M. H. Vol. I, 471) that 'Lakhnauti' (*l.* 21) is a blunder and that the Qāẓī and the Shaikh were residents, not of 'Lakhnauti' in Bengal, but of *Lakhnaur* in Rohilkhand. Otherwise, how could the governor of Sambhal issue and enforce his orders for the attendance of two judicial officers who were subjects of the independent sovereign of another country and owed no allegiance to Sikandar. Lakhnor or Shāhābād, as it is now called, lies about twelve *Kos* east of Sambhal.

IV. 489, *l.* 5. *He [Islām Shāh] said: 'I have a number of Afghāns in my service, who are very unruly, and whom I will now hand over to you'.*

من تا غایت افغانان بی‌سررا نگاه داشتم اکنون اینهارا بتو سپارم

Ṭ. A. Lith. 233, *l.* 4 from foot.

"These indisciplined, refractory or disobedient [بی سر] Afghāns I have so long, or upto now [after our father's death] kept under control. Now, I hand over their governance to you." Budāūnī has copied the very words of the Ṭ. A.

IV. 513, foot note 2, *l.* **7.** *It does not appear that the power of the Lohānī Afghāns entirely expired with Dāūd Shāh, for we find his younger brother, Khwāja 'Usmān, maintaining a fruitless struggle for twenty years against Jahāngīr.*

This is confused and incorrect. Khwāja 'Uṣmān was not Dāūd's younger brother. He was the second son of 'Īsā Khān Lohānī. Dāūd was the younger son of Sulaimān Kararānī. Dāūd was really succeeded by Qatlū, who led the Bengal Afghāns for about 14 years. His minister, 'Īsā Khān Lohānī Miānkhel, then stepped into his shoes and was in power for a time. 'Īsā had five sons, named Sulaimān, Uṣmān, Walī, Malhī and Ibrāhīm. Sulaimān, the eldest, was chosen as his father's *locum tenens*, but died very early and was followed by Khwāja 'Uṣmān, who was the brother of Sulaimān and not of Dāūd. Uṣmān contrived to remain in some sort of power for twenty years, until his defeat and death in 1021 H. (*Makhzan-i-Afghānī* Mullā Fīrūz Library MS. Folios 90b to 93a; Dorn, History of the Afghans, I. 183). Elliot has been misled by Dorn who says here that 'Uṣmān was Dāūd's brother, but the error is corrected in the fuller account in the notes from Dr. Lee's copy of the *Makhzan* in Vol. II, 115.

This is what we learn from the Histories of the Afghāns. Abū-l-Fazl enables us to fix the chronology more precisely. Qatlū or Qutlū was defeated by Rājā Mān Simha in a great battle in the 35th year and died ten days afterwards. His minor son Naṣīr was brought by his *Wakīl*, Khwāja 'Īsā to pay his respects and make his submission to the Rājā on the 4th of Shahrīvar of that year, 17th August 1590 (A. N. III. 580-1 = Tr. III. 880). Khwāja Īsā appears to have died before the 37th year (*Ibid.* III. 611 = Tr. III. 934). He was succeeded in the wakilship by Sulaimān, who was killed in the siege of Būsna or Bhūshna on the 10th of Tīr of the 41st year, 22nd June 1596 (*Ibid.* III. 711 = Tr. III. 1059). 'Uṣmān succeeded him, but was routed and killed in the battle of Nek Ujyāl or Adhār on 2nd March 1612 (O. S.). He "maintained the fruitless struggle" against the Mughals under

Akbar and Jahāngīr for only about sixteen years and not twenty (T. J. text. 102, *l.* 23; Tr. I. 210).

IV. 526, *l.* 7. *With a valiant army of Turks and by the aid of the King ['Alāu-d-daulā Mas'ūd] they took Mulhī, the accursed God-forsaken Chief of Hind.*

This Mulhī is said to have been the King of Qanauj. Now, there are two inscriptions in which the Yuvarāja of Madanapāladeva of Qanauj is said to have compelled the Hammīra (Amīr) to lay aside his enmity" (Ind. Ant. XVIII. 16, 18) and "protected Bārāṇasī (Benares) from the wicked Turushka warrior" (*Epig. Ind.* IX, 324, 327). As Madanapāla reigned from about 1100 to 1114 A. C. and Sulṭān Mas'ūd III from 1098 to 1115 A. C., it has been recently suggested that this 'Mulhī' may be a Musalman corruption of 'Madanapāla' (Dr. R. S. Tripāthi, History of Kanauj, 307-8), but the phonetic resemblance stops at the very first letter of the names and the phraseology of the epigraph is too vague to be of any use for historical purposes.

IV. 540, *l.* 19. *He also read one of the Takmīlas of Ghausu-s-Siklain and the whole of the Hisn-i-Hasin and other miscellaneous prayers.*

The 'Ḥiṣn-i-Ḥaṣīn' is a collection of "Numerous Forms of Prayer, and Pious Ejaculations to be used on various occasions" which was compiled by Muhammad-i-Jazīrī. There is a commentary upon it in Arabic as well as Persian (Stewart, Catalogue of Tippoo Sultan's Library, 175). Budāūnī tells us that when Akbar was greatly incensed with him for overstaying his leave, he took to repeating the *Ḥiṣn-i-Ḥaṣīn* and the *Qaṣīdah Burda* and his prayers were answered (Text II, 384; Tr. II, 397).

The *Takmīla*, may have been a collection of the ninetynine names of the Ghauṣ-i-A'ẓam, 'Abdu-l-Qādir Jīlānī. As the ninetynine names of God are given in all prayer books, there are collections of the ninetynine names of Muḥammad, 'Alī and Fāṭima also. Similar tables of the ninetynine names of several saints also have been prepared. Blochmann says that he had a manuscript containing such tables for 'Abdu-l-Qādir Jīlānī, Farīd Shakarganj and Niẓāmu-d-dīn Auliyā (J. A. S. B. 1871, Pt. 1, p. 257 note). Ja'far Sharīf also assures his readers that "whenever he was oppressed in mind × × he used to constantly repeat the ninetynine names of the Peer-e-Dustgeer and through the mercy of the Almighty, His Excellency Gows-ool-Azam presented himself to him in his sleep, relieved him of the perplexities

which distressed him and vouchsafed his behests" (Qanoon-e-Islam, 1st Edit. p. 237). But this 'Takmīla' was more probably, the حصار کامل 'The Perfect Bulwark', a collection of Prayers and Invocations in Arabic, ascribed to the Ghauṣ-uṣ-Siqlain himself, *i. e.* 'Abdu-l -Qādir Jīlānī. The India Office Library possesses a copy (q. v. Ethé. Catalogue, Col. 1420, Ms. No. 2629) of this Takmīla.

IV. 552, *l.* 6. *Amīn Shāh (of Mālwā) according to custom, demanded a present.*

The correct form is 'Amīd (عميد) Shāh and this is the spelling found in two contemporary inscriptions in the Lāt Masjid at Dhār (Maulavi Ẓafar Hasan's Art. 'On the Inscriptions of Dhār and Māndū' in *Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica*, 1909-10, pp. 11, 12, 13). Jahāngīr who visited the masjid calls him 'Amīd Shāh Dāūd Ghorī (*Tūzuk-i-Jahāngīrī*, text, 201, *l.* 7 from foot; tr. I. 407). He also cites five couplets from one of the epigraphs (*Ibid*. 202, *l.* 5; Tr. I. 408). 'Amīd was the original name of Dilāwar Khān, the founder of the independent Sultanate of Mālwā.

IV. 555, *l.* 21. *One day, the horse on which he used to ride fell sick. They gave him something that was prohibited by religion as medicine etc.*

A very similar tale of punctilious abstention from any substance possessing or supposed to possess narcotic properties is related of Sulṭān Muẓaffar II of Gujarāt in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* (Text 183-4; Bayley's tr. 283).

The story which follows of the handful of wheat over each grain of which the entire *qurān* had been recited is related as an actual fact in a much older chronicle of the equally weak-witted and credulous Sulṭān, Fīrūz Tughlaq, by his contemporary panegyrist Shams-i-Sirāj 'Afīf (*Tarīkh-i-Fīrūzshāhī* B. I. text 447-449).

VOL. V. BĀBUR, HUMĀYŪN, AKBAR

V. 1, *l.* 13. ***The author (Ahmad Yādgār) mentions incidentally that his father was Wazīr to Mirzā 'Askarī, when the latter was in command of Humāyūn's forces in Gujarāt.***

I have pointed out in the note on this passage in S. I. M. H. Vol. I, 484 that there is no truth in this statement or rather supposition. This 'incidental mention' is in Aḥmad's account of Humāyūn's reign, which is copied almost *verbatim* from the *Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī*. The fact is predicated there of the father of the author of that work, *i. e.* of the father of Niẓāmu-d-dīn Aḥmad, and not of that of Aḥmad Yādgār. The recent publication of the text of Aḥmad Yādgār's chronicie makes it possible to cite the relevant sentences side by side.

این ضعیف از پدر خود که در آن وقت وزیر میرزا عسکری بود شنیده که در نیم روز هوا کمال حرارت داشت گجراتیان از احمدآباد بسرعت رسیده آمدند	این ضعیف از پدر خود که در آن زمان وزیر میرزا عسکری بوده شنیده که در نیم روز که هوا در غایت حرارت بوده گجراتیان از احمدآباد بسرعت رسیدند
Ṭ. A. Lith. 198, *l.* 11; B. I. text II. 37.	Aḥmad Yādgār, B. I. text, 143, *l.* 2 from foot.

It may be noted that Aḥmad has made several verbal alterations in the passage. He has also omitted two lines which immediately follow the word رسیده. It is clear, therefore, that he has not copied the sentence mechanically and hastily or unwittingly, but deliberately and after fully understanding its import. He could have easily cut out the lying asseveration about the wazīrship, if he had chosen to do so. As it is, he stands convicted of false personation, of an attempt to palm himself off as—what he was not—the son of a dignitary of Humāyūn's.

V. 5, *l.* 12. ***After that, the Sultān [Buhlūl Lodī] carried his victorious army into Munkhār ...... Thence he returned to Sirhind.***

The *Bibl. Ind.* text reads the name as نیمکهار *Nīmkhār.* It differs further from Elliot's version in averring that the Sulṭān returned, not to *Sirhind,* but to the city, از آنجا باز در شهر آمده (p. 20, *l.* 12), that is, to Dehlī. The reading and the identification proposed in the note on this passage in S. I. M. H. Vol. I, 485 may be therefore taken as almost certainly correct. We may be also sure that سرهند is an error for **شہر .**

V. 9, *l.* 5 from foot. *At this period, Shāhzāda Jalāl Khān, having set up a jewelled throne ...... sat there in state on the 15th of Zī-l-hijja, 923 A. H. (Dec. 1517).*

There appears to be some muddlement here. Niẓāmu-d-dīn and Firishta assert that it was Ibrāhīm who celebrated his coronation on Friday, 15th Ẕī-l-ḥijja 923 H. (Ṭ. A. 174, *l.* 15; F. I. 188, *l.* 2 from foot). Aḥmad Yādgār seems to have interchanged and jumbled up the names of the brothers. As Niʿmatullāh throws in the weight of such authority as he may be supposed to have, on the same side (Dorn, I. 71), we may be sure that it is the later compiler who is chargeable with error.

Aḥmad Yādgār's account of Ibrāhīm's reign is manifestly borrowed from the Ṭ. A. and as its author does not give the date of Jalāl Khān's coronation anywhere, we may be sure that here also, Aḥmad has got hold of the wrong end of the stick. At the same time, it is necessary to point out that the date is not quite correct. 15th Ẕī-l-ḥijja 923 H. was not a Friday, but a Tuesday. Here, as elsewhere, پانزدهم is a miswriting of یازدهم eleventh. The question is clinched by the fact that Aḥmad Yādgār (p. 13), Niẓāmu-d-dīn and Firishta all assert that Ibrāhīm marched to Jaunpūr on Thursday, the 24th Ẕī-l-ḥijja. If the 24th was a Thursday, the serial order would require Friday to have fallen on the 11th and not the 15th and the former must be the true date of Ibrāhīm Lodī's coronation.

V. 10, *l.* 8 from foot. *The governor of that place [Oude] fled towards Karra.*

The Ṭ. A. (Lith. 175, *l.* 11), F. (I. 189, *l.* 10) and Niʿmatullāh (Dorn. I. 72) agree in saying that he fled to Lucknow, and that is more probable, though the B. I. text or Aḥmad Yādgār also has بجانب کره (70, *l.* 1). But Aḥmad has copied all this from the Ṭ. A. and he cannot be supposed to know better than his master.

V. 12, *l.* 6 from foot. *Sultān Jalālu-d-dīn ...... fled to Garha-Kantak, where he fell into the hands of the Gonds, who seized him etc.*

Here, the *Bibl. Ind.* text has a very different reading:
و آنجا بدست گنوازان گرفتار شد (73, *l.* 4 from foot).

"He fell into the hands of and was taken captive by the *ganwārs*, *i. e.* villagers." As this is the reading found in all the three manuscripts collated for the Bibl. Ind. text, it would seem that the translator had read it گنداوان *Gondāwān* (Gonds). The Ṭ. A. (177, *l.* 13),

the *Makhzan-i-Afghānī* (MS. in Mullā Fīrūz Library, Bombay), Niʿmatullāh, (Tr. Dron, I. 74) and Firishta (I. 190, *l.* 11) have گوندان *Gondān* and Sujān Rāi fulminates against the inhumanity and dishonouruble conduct نامردی و بی مروتي of the Gonds [گوندوان] who captured and delivered him up to his enemy (*Khulāṣatu-t-Tawārīkh*, Edit. Ẓafar Ḥasan, 277, *l.* 7 from foot).

V. 14 last line. *Islām Khān threw off the mask of obedience in Agra and began to assemble an army.*

Here, two MSS have 'Agra', but one reads the name as 'Karra' (*B. I.* text 76, *l.* 8 and note) and the latter is, most probably, the correct lection. The Ṭ. A. (B. I. text I. 349, *l.* 4), F. (I. 190, *l.* 14), B. (I. 327 = Tr. I. 433–4) and Dorn (I. 74) agree in favouring 'Karra.' The correctness of the variant is indicated by the fact that Islām Khān's father, Aʿẓam Humāyūn Sarwānī, was then the Ḥākim of the district of Karra (Ṭ. A. Lith. 176, *l.* 3 from foot; F. I. 190, *l.* 3). 'Agra' is, besides, impossible, as it was the capital of the kingdom, and Ibrāhīm himself is said to have been there at the time, and to have summoned Aʿẓam Humāyūn to Āgra and thrown him into prison there (Ṭ. A. Lith. 177, *l.* 10 ff.).

V. 15, *l.* 2 from foot. *At last, a soldier of the Sultān's, facing Islām Khān, discharged his matchlock at him, and struck him in the forehead, when he fell to the earth.*

This is somewhat differently related in the B. I. text 77, *l.* 8.

ناگاه پیل جنگ آور کہ بروي اسلام خان بوده تفنگي از طرف سپاه سلطاني بر پیشانی خورد - برگشتہ بر فوج خود افتاد باعث تفرقہ سپاه مخالفان گردید درین حال سپاه سلطاني حملہ آورد و ...... اسلام خان کشتہ شد -

"Suddenly, a warlike elephant on which Islām Khān was mounted received a bullet in his forehead from the matchlock of a soldier of the Sulṭān's. He turned back and fell upon the troops on his own side. The rebel army was consequently thrown into confusion. The emperor's troops then attacked them and Islām Khān was killed as rebellion and ingratitude never bear good fruit."

But neither the *Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī*, from which Aḥmad has barrowed his account, nor Firishta, nor Niʿmatullāh says anything about a bullet having penetrated the skull of either Islām Khān or his elephant. All that they state is that he was killed and that this was the fit reward of

his disloyalty and ingratitude. It is not necessary to discuss whether the defeat of the insurgents was due to the musket shot having found its target in the forehead of the pachyderm or of its rider. The use of firearms on either side at this time is so very problematical, that the whole story may be rejected, like many other factitious and fictitious 'novelties' which disfigure Aḥmad's compilation.

V. 23, *l.* 6. *The Sulṭān [Ibrāhīm Lodī] then ordered him [Dilāwar Khān] to be taken to the dungeons, in order that he might see several nobles suspended from the walls.*

The phrase used in the text is کہ بعضی امرای کبارراً
در دیوار گرفتہ بودند p. 87, *l.* 5 from foot.

This literally means that "they were enclosed within walls," not 'suspended' from them. Exactly the same expression is used on p. 89, *l.* 6 from foot بعضی را در دیوار گرفت.

Elliot's rendering there also is, "He has suspended some from walls" (E. D. V. 24). A similar locution is found in the *Tūzuk* of the Emperor Jahāngīr, who states that when "Dilāwar Khān, the son of Daulat Khān Lodī refused to take service under Shēr Khān Sūr, the latter was enraged and ordered him to be shut up in a wall, *i. e.* to be built up in it" (Tr. Rogers and Beveridge I. 88).

شیرخان برآشفت و فرمود کہ اورا درمیان دیوار نہادند

Tūzuk, text 43, *l.* 3 from foot.

A similar punishment was inflicted by Sulṭān Maḥmūd Laṭīf of Gujarāt upon the wretch, Burhān, who afterwards took his revenge by assassinating him. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* writes :

حکم فرمود کہ این نا درست را در دیوار برآرند p. 344, *l.* 2.

Sir Clive Bayley's rendering is, "He ordered that they should build the scoundrel into a wall" (tr. 447; Tr. Fazl. 246). Niẓāmu-d-dīn, in relating the event, states that he was built up in a wall and only a small aperture was left for the entry and exit of the breath." درمیان دیوار چیدہ و روزنی برای آمد و شد نفس گذاشتہ
Ṭ. A. 512, *l.* 14. Firishta says that "he" was درمیان دیوار گذاشتہ (II. 227, *l.* 5). The *Tarīkh-i-Alfī* makes the matter quite clear and puts it thus ;

نوبتي برهانرا بواسطهٔ تقصیر خدمتی درمیان دیوار نهاد و اطرافش را بگل
وسنگ بسیار استوار ساخت و روزنی بجهت آمد و شد نفس گذاشتم بعد از
ساعتی آزاد کرد

Mullā Fīrūz Library, MS.; Rehatsek's Catalogue, IV. 42. Chronicle of 962 A. H.

"Once upon a time, the Sultān ordered Burhān to be enclosed (lit. placed) in a wall for some negligence in attendance. The sides were made fast with clay and stones and a small window only was left for the coming in and going out of the breath. But after a time, he was released."

Budāūnī relates a very similar anecdote of Islām Shāh Sūr and he also uses the very same phrase در دیوار گرفتم. He says that when Sa'id Khān, the brother of the rebel A'zam Humāyūn was at Court, the Sultān showed him the heads of the Amīrs who had been built up in walls.

سرهاي امرا را که زنده در دیوار گرفته بود × × باو نموده گفت که
اینهارامی‌شناسی که چه کسانند او بعضی را که می شناخت نام برد

I. 379, *l*. 7 from foot.

This kind of punishment was not uncommon in the good old days. Shahājī, the father of Shivājī, is said, "by Mahratta tradition", to have been "confined in a stone dungeon, the door of which was built up, except a small opening and he was told that if within a certain time, his son did not submit, the aperture should be for ever closed" (Grant Duff, H. M. Reprint, 1873, p. 65). The Khalīf Walīd is said to have ordered the two daughters of Dāhir "to be enclosed between walls" (*Chachnāma* in E. D. I. 211; Text 247, *l*. 4).

فرمود تا هردو خواهررا در دیوار گرفتند

The true meaning of the phrase is thus put beyond doubt, but is the story true of Ibrāhīm Lodī? Ahmad Yādgār's yarns are so often fathered upon the wrong persons or retailed in connection with the wrong places or circumstances, that, we may, not unreasonably, suspect this to be a mere replica of Budāūnī's anecdote of Islām Shāh.

V. 25, *l*. 3. *He [Bābur] despatched Jahāngīr Qulī Khān, with 2000 Mughal horsemen to take precautions for securing the roads and ferries (on the route to Hindustān).*

The introduction of this name here is one of the adventitious and random guesses which are only too numerous in Ahmad's ***Tārīkh***.

Jahāngīr Qulī's name does not occur anywhere in the 'Memoirs of Bābur' or other chronicles, in connection with any events of his reign. He is *first* mentioned in all the more authentic histories only in 944 H., in the narratives of the Bengal campaign of Humāyūn.

His father Ibrāhīm Beg Chāpūq, was one of Bābur's braves (B. N. Tr. 67, 83, 173, 334, 643), but Jahāngīr Qulī himself does not appear to have been in Bābur's service and was taken up only by Humāyūn.

V. 33, *l.* 13. *One day [Haibat Khān Gurgandāz] made a pleasant party with Daryā Khān Sarwānī, Mahmūd Khān Lodī and Daulat Khān Urmar.*

An Afghān tribe called 'Urmar' does exist and their ancestor is said to have been the son of Sharkhbūn (*Āīn.* tr. II. 402; Dorn, II. 41, 122, 129). But the B. I. text reads the sentence thus :

روزي × × × جشنی ترتیب داده دریا خان سرواني محمود خان لودي

109, *l.* 2 from foot. و دولت خان از امرا درمجلس نشستہ بودند

and no variant lection is noted. If this be correct, آرمر is a misreading of ازآمرا.

V. 35, *l.* 4 from foot. *Hasan Khān [Mewātī's] family had possessed regal power until the reign of Fīroz Shāh.*

ازعهد فیروز شاه دولت و جاه درخاندان ایشان جمع آمده بود

116, *l.* 4 from foot.

"Power and dignity had been vested in their family *from* the reign of Fīrūz Shāh." Ḥasan Khān was descended from the *Khānzādas* of Mewāt, who are said to have been Jādon Rājputs converted in the reign of Sulṭān Fīrūz Tughlaq (I. C. XII. 401 : Crooke : Tribes and Castes. III. 233).

Bābur states that Ḥasan Khān and his ancestors had ruled Mewāt "one after another, for a hundred years or more" (B. N. tr. 578, *Tūzuk-i-Bāburī*, Pers. tr. 215, *l.* 2).

V. 38, *l.* 1. ***Junaid behaved in such a way towards the Afghāns, that no one sided with them.***

سلطان جنید با افغانان چنان پیش آمد کہ رویِ بطرف

120, *l.* 6. جونپور نمي کردند

"Sulṭān Junaid dealt with the Afghāns in such a way that they did not dare to turn their faces towards [even look towards or glance at] Jaunpūr."

The meaning is that he was held in such awe by the Afghāns and had established his authority and prestige so completely that the thought of undertaking any hostile projects against or recapturing the province of which he was the governor, never so much entered their heads. They were so cowed down and stood in such awe of his power, that they did not dare to cast longing eyes upon the Mughal conquest.

V. 39, *l.* 9. *And the nephew of Shahrak retired to a garden two Kos distant.*

122, *l.* 7. برادر زادهٔ راجہ شیرک شده در مقابلهٔ ایشان فرود آمد

"The nephew of the Rājā, having become impudently daring [or audacious, lit. a little tiger], now encamped just opposite to them."

The sentence has been wrongly construed. The word is شیرک not شہرک. The real meaning is that elated by his momentary success, the Rājā's nephew thought he was 'the cock of the walk', and was so foolhardy as to confront his foes and attack them.

In *l.* 19 of this page, he is spoken of as the brother of the Rājā, but this must be due to an oversight, as the text has برادر زادهٔ (123, *l.* 1).

V. 39 last line. *After this [the conquest of Chanderī], he [Bābur] spent two months in that place in country excursions and hunting, and returned to Agra.*

Four *days* would be in greater accordance with fact. Chanderī was taken by Bābur on Wednesday, 7th Jumādī I, 934 H. and he left it, according to his own account, on Sunday the 11th of the same month (B. N. tr. 595, 598; *Tūzuk*, Pers. tr. 220–1; E. D. IV. 277–8). See also Abū-l-Fazl who makes it four days (*A. N.* I. 112; tr. I. 268).

V. 41, *l.* 9. *'Alī Kulī was unable to effect anything on account of the vigilance of the Kanwārs.*

In the passage translated on p. 12 (*l.* 3 from foot) of E. D. V., this word seems to have been read as گنداوان (Gonds) while all the three copies used for the *B. I.* text have گنواران. Here, it is just the other way about. In *ll.* 9 and 13 from foot of this translation, Elliot has 'Kanwārs' گنواران; but the *B. I.* text eschews the word and reads منداهران in its stead.

علي قلي در تردد تقصیر نکرد اما منداهران نگذاشتند
126, *l.* 9. که گرد دیہ کسي بگردد

Again in *l.* 13 from foot, Elliot states that "the royalist troops turned their backs and fled, followed by the *Kanwārs*; but the sentence reads differently in the B. I. text and speaks of 'Mandāhars' and not *ganwārs*.

ترسم بهادر آنچه قرار یافتم بود پشت داده روان شد مندا هران دنبال کردند
127, *l.* 5.

But this word گنواران also occurs in the B. I. text in an untranslated passage and there can be no doubt that Aḥmad Yādgār was well acquainted with it.

192, *l.* 8. گنواران بغرور جمعیت خود درین کار انکار کردند

"But the rustics, priding themselves on their numbers, refused to do so."

V. 41, *l.* 3 from foot. *The village ...... still continues to be a desert, and has never been inhabited again, although 160 years have elapsed since its destruction.*

This important passage occurs, with a slight variation, in all the three manuscripts which the editor of the *Bibliotheca Indica* text has used in its preparation. In one of them, it is worded thus :

و آن دیه را برابر خاک ساختم الی یومنا که یک صد و سی سال بر آمد آن دیه ویران ماند باز آباد نشد ۔

In the other two, the sentence reads as follows :

و آن دیه تا الی یومنا از پرگنه کهتیل که یک صد و شصت سال بر آمده خراب افتاده است
127, *l.* 4 from foot.

It will be noticed that the difference is not really material. Even if the number of years which had elapsed since the destruction of the village about 935 H. was only 130, the occurrence of the remark would prove beyond doubt that Aḥmad Yādgār's chronicle could not have been composed before 1065 H. (935 + 130) *at the earliest*. Consequently, there cannot be a shadow of doubt that the claim or pretence of his having been a servant of Dāūd Shāh Kararānī (who was put to death in 984 H.) must be as false as the asseveration or supposition about his father having been the Wazīr of Mīrzā 'Askarī in 942 H.

In this connection, it may be observed that of the three manuscripts, two belonging to the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal and the Buhar collection are both copies of each other and admittedly modern. The third is described as an independent transcript. It contains at the end four couplets in which the date of completion is precisely

stated to have been Monday, the 4th of Shawwāl 1054 H. Dr. Hidāyat Ḥusain, the editor, who acquiesces in and has pinned his faith to Elliot's opinion that Aḥmad Yādgār's chronicle was completed in or about 1023 H. pleads that these *baits* must have been composed and added by the copyist and not by the author. He supposes 1054 H. to be the date of *transcription* of this particular copy. But a simple calculation will suffice to knock the bottom out of this surmise. He has overlooked the fact that this is the manuscript in which it is clearly stated that the village remained uninhabited for 130 years after its destruction in or about 935 H., and as 935 + 130 sum up to 1065, it is obvious that the manuscript in which this statement is found could not possibly have been written eleven years earlier in 1054 H. This simple calculation is fatal to his theory and may engender the suspicion that the metrical colophon is sophisticated. It looks as if it had been appended "to impart to the manuscript" a deceptive appearance of antiquity". Such fakes and devices are not unknown in Persian manuscripts. See Rieu : Catalogue, I, 120.

V. 42, *l.* 11 from foot. *Do not put your brothers to death, but look sharply after them.*

128, *l.* 4 from foot. برادران را نکشي اغماض فرمای

"Do not slay your brothers. Overlook [wink at, turn a blind eye to their misconduct]" غمز or غمزه means 'a wink or glance of the eye.' cf. Jauhar, trans. Stewart, reprint, p. 38.

V. 44, *l.* 7. *After giving the matter a little reflection, Bībī Bāī sent him to Mālwā.*

آن زن کوتہ اندیش فکر نکرده آن چنان امرای زبردست کہ پشت پناه پسراو بود بصوبۂ مالوا فرستاد

274, *l.* 7.

"That short-sighted woman *thoughtlessly* sent away such a powerful Amīr who was the prop and pillar of her son to the Ṣūba of Mālwā." She did not give the matter any 'consideration' at all and behaved like a foolish woman.

V. 44, *l.* 12. ***Mamrez Khān ...... who had lived at Bayāna, feigning eccentricity and madness... .***

But the B. I. text has خود را بطریق مخنثان ساختہ بود 275 foot-note. "Who had made himself [*i. e.* pretended to be] like a eunuch." The translator must have read مجنونان. It should be noted that the words occur only in one of the three manuscripts used by the editor, the other two leave them out.

V. 46, *l.* 10. ***The Afghāns also prepared trenches and batteries and made war.***

278, *l.* 9. افغانان نیز کوچهٔ سلامت و تباتها طیار ساختم جنگ میکردند

کوچهٔ سلامت and تباطها (or ساباطها) are really covered ways or approaches used during a siege, *q. v.* the note on E. D. VII. *l.* 12 in S. I. M. H. Vol. I, 629.

V. 53, *l.* 13 from foot. *He ['Adalī] determined to fly to Chunār with all the royal jewels, in the event of defeat.*

The words used are علامات بادشاهی 'insignia of royalty.' They are "the throne [اورنگ], umbrellas [چتر] adorned with jewels of which there are never less than seven, [سایبان or آفتابگیر] of an oval form and a yard in length which is held by an attendant to keep off the rays of the sun and [کوکبہ] (blazing stars or suns), several of which are hung up before the Assembly Hall." Abū-l-Faẓl explicitly states that "these four insignia are only used by kings" (*Āīn.* tr. I. 50).

V. 57, *l.* 9 from foot. *He [Humāyūn] wished to go to Maryam Makānī and seek succour and assistance from her.*

There is a blunder or dislocation here in the translation. Two paragraphs which have no connection with each other have been mixed up. What is stated here about Humāyūn's preparations for invading India relates to the events of 961 H. But the five lines which follow about Humāyūn setting out with 22 (not 200) men including Bairām Khān, Khwāja Mu'aẓẓam *et cetera* refer to that emperor's flight to Persia in 950 H.—eleven years earlier! Aḥmad Yādgār's account of the first part of Humāyūn's reign, *i. e.* upto his flight to Persia terminates at p. 172 of the B. I. text. This is followed by chapters on the Sūr kings. The story of his subsequent adventures and of the invasion of Hindustān is taken up at p. 301.

The peccant sentence reads thus in two manuscripts

خواستند تا بخدمت سلیمان مکانی شاه طهماسپ رفتم معاونت و امداد طلبد

301, *l.* 8 ff.

"He wished to go to the *Sulaimān-makānī* Shāh Ṭahmāsp and implore his help and assistance". But some chuckle-headed scribe substituted *Maryam makānī* for *Sulaimān makānī*, because her name is mentioned just a few words after and she is said to have been sent for and brought down to the king's own camp. The translator has blindly followed this manuscript and made nonsense of the passage.

Humāyūn wanted to go to the great and powerful Shāh of Persia for help and not to his wife.

V. 62, *l.* 6 from foot. *When they were about to depart, they begged him [Sayyid Jamāl Thānesarī] to give them the assistance of his prayers.*

بوقت رخصت فاتحهٔ استمداد از حضرت ایشان در خواستند

T. M. 355, *l.* 8.

"They entreated His Holiness to recite a *Fātiha* [the opening chapter of the Qurān] soliciting divine assistance or God's blessing on their enterprise." Cf. the similar story of Sikandar Lodī in the *Tārīkh-i-Dāūdī*, E. D. IV. 444 and the note on it in S. I. M. H. Vol. I, 468.

V. 62, *l.* 2 from foot. *The Sayyid ...... then said to them, 'Have you not heard what little boys at play say?' He then dismissed them.*

This is scarcely intelligible, as the 'saying' referred to is left out in the translation. The obscurity is cleared up by the B. I. text, in which the saying which is the subject of this cryptic allusion is transcribed thus: سون سون بانیان کان پکڑ آنیان *Saun Saun bānyān, kān pakaḍ ānyān* (p. 356).

'They have displayed hundreds of clever tricks, but have at last come back pinching (or gripping) their ears (with their own fingers in token of abasement and discomfiture).' B. I. text 356 last line and the editor's note. This "crucible of austerity and devotion and paragon of the people of rapture and ecstasy" as B. calls this Sayyid, lived on up to 989 H. (B. II. 312 = tr. 322).

V. 64, *l.* 9 from foot. *I place my trust in God. If you fail in this etc.*

T. M. 360, *l.* 15. نعوذباالله منها اگر سستی درین کار رود

"But if, *and God forbid it*, if this affair is dealt with, slackly, (indolently or half-heartedly)". نعوذباالله منها literally means 'Let us fly to God from this' (evil or inauspicious thing). 'God preserve us from this' (misfortune and calamity).

V. 64, *l.* 3 from foot. *After this, they said to Ahmad Beg, the madman, who was unequalled throughout the world in foretelling the future by what he saw in the blade-bone of a sheep, etc.*

This mode of divination appears to have been practised in many parts of Europe and Asia and seems to have been known also to the Greeks and Romans. William of Rubruck describes the *Mongol* method thus :

"When the Khan wishes to undertake anything, he has brought to him three of these bones, and holding them between his hands, he thinks about what he wants to do; will he do it or will he not? Then he gives these bones to one of his men to burn them. × × Once charred black, they are brought to the Khan who examines them very attentively to see if the heat of the fire has left them intact throughout their entire length. If so, he deems that he can carry out his intentions. If, on the contrary, he notices the least crevice there, or that any fragment is detached he does nothing" (Travels in Sir Henry Yule : Cathay and the Way Thither, Ed. Cordier, See also Vambery, Sketches of Central Asia, 219; Lubbock : Origin of Civilization, 238; Tylor, Primitive Culture, I. 124; Elphinstone, Account of the Kingdom of Caubul, Ed. 1839, I. 292). It appears to have been formerly practised even in England, and was known as "reading the speal-bone" (Brand, Popular Antiquities, III. 339). It is said to be still in use among the shepherds in Greece.

V. 70, *l.* 9. *Tārīkh-i-Nizāmī, Ma'dan-i-Akbar and Akbar-nāma. [The correct title of the second work is Ma'dan-i-Akhbār-i-Aḥmadī. It is a general history compiled by Aḥmad bin Bahbal bin Jamāl Kamgū, alias Kambū, about 1023 H. (Rieu : Persian Catalogue, III. 888 ; Ethé : India Office Catalogue, No. 121)].*

It is mentioned in terms of high praise by Ni'matullāh and described as "a repository of history of unparalleled value" (Dorn, I. 4).

V. 77, Footnote 2. *l.* 2. *Firishta makes it [the date of the accession of Sulṭān Bahlūl] a year earlier, 854.*

There is some error here. The year is given as 855 in words as well as in figures, in the Cawnpore Lith. of F's history (I. 173, *l.* 3 and also I. 175, *l.* 16). Dowson has been misled by the translation of Briggs (I. 543).

V. 85, *l.* 1. *He [The Sulṭān] presented the kettle-drum and standard he had wrested from Daryā Khān to Narsing Deo, the son of Rāi Partāb. Daryā Khān took advantage of an opportunity, and with the approval of Kutb Khān, slew Narsing Deo. Kutb Khān, Husain Khān, Mubāriz Khān, and Rāi Partāb, having entered into a conspiracy, went over to the Sharkī monarch.*

The passage is none too clear and Elliot remarks that though "Ni'matullāh represents that this conspiracy arose in consequence of the assassination of Narsing Deo, there seems to be no connexion between the two events." This is because Ni'matullāh has, in transcribing the passage from the *Ṭabaqāt*, done it so carelessly as to travesty its meaning. Elliot has then made the confusion worse by quoting Firishta from the loose and slipshod paraphrase of Briggs without troubling to look at the original text. What Niẓāmu-d-dīn, the primary authority, states is that Daryā Khān Lodī slew Narsingh Deo *with* the approval, consent or counsel (باستصواب) of Quṭb Khān (Lodī) and that Quṭb Khān, the son of Ḥusain Khān Afghān, and Mubāriz Khān Bhaṭa and Rāi Partāb were thereby so aggrieved that they went over to the Jaunpūr Sulṭān (Lith. 155, *l.* 2 from foot; B. I. text I. 307, *l.* 5). Here, as elsewhere, F. merely follows the Ṭ. A. and states that the assassination was perpetrated *with* the permission, approbation, connivance (بتجویز) of Quṭb Khān *Lodī* (I. 176, *l.* 4 from foot). He has only substituted تجویز for استصواب and added the *nisba* of Quṭb Khān. There is really no difficulty in understanding the 'connexion' between the murder and the mutiny. The matter has perplexed only because the two Amīrs named Quṭb Khān have not been distinguished. Quṭb Khān, the abettor, if not instigator, of the crime was a Lodī. He was the first cousin of the Sulṭān and also the brother of Buhlūl's favourite wife. Daryā Lodī also was the son of another uncle of the Sulṭān's and as such another first cousin. The two relatives collogued together, probably because each had his own axe to grind. The Quṭb Khān who joined the father of the murdered man in the revolt was the son of Ḥusain Khān and governor of Rāprī. He had paid homage to Buhlūl with great reluctance and only after standing a siege (Ni'matullāh, E. D. V. 79). Rāi Partāb's allegiance had always sat very loosely upon him and his defection needs no explanation, as his son had been done to death, just when he had been sent to court to pay his respects to the Sulṭān. Dr. Dorn is quite wrong in making it appear that Sulṭān Buhlūl "presented the kettle-drum and standard which he had taken from Daryā Khān to Narsing Deo." The Ṭ. A. and F. agree in stating that Narsing was murdered, because Rāi Partāb had taken or captured in battle those badges of honour from Daryā Khān. Briggs has put the wrong side foremost in asserting that Narsing was assassinated '*in spite of* the opposition of Kuṭb Khān, the son of Ḥusain Khān'. He has jumbled up the two men named Quṭb

Khān and then read بی استصواب instead of باستصواب to patch up the sense. It may be also worth while to point out that the name should be read as Quṭb Khān-i-Ḥusain Khān, with the *Iẓāfat-i-ibnī*, to indicate the relationship between the two individuals. The comma after 'Quṭb Khān' is wrong and misleading. As the matter has been grievously perplexed by the errors committed by the later compilers, it may be as well to cite the actual words of the *Ṭabaqāt*—the original source from which all the other accounts are derived.

قبل ازین راي پرتاب یک نیزه که در آن روزگار بمنزلهٔ علم سرداری میبوده است و یک نقاره از دریاخان بزور گرفته بود دریاخان از روی انتقام نرسنک پسرا ورا باستصواب قطب‌خان بقتل رسانید درین اثنا قطب خان پسر حسین خان و مبارزخان بهتر و رای پرتاب با سلطان حسین شرقی موافق شدند .

(Lith. 155, *l.* 3 from foot, B. I. text I. 307, *l.* 5).

The *Makhzan* puts it thus :

ونقاره وعلم که از درباخان بزور گرفته بود براي نرسنک دیو پسر راي پرتاب مرحمت فرمود دریاخان درین محل فرصت یافته باستصواب قطب خان نرسنگ دیورا بقتل رسانده قطب‌خان پسر حسین خان و مبارزخان و راي پرتاب اتفاق نموده سلطان حسین شرقی را موافق شدند

(Mullā Fīrūz Library manuscript, Rehatsek's Catalogue, IV. 9, folio 42 b, last line).

V. 89, Footnote 4. *Firishta says that Bībī Khūnza, daughter of the late King, Sultān 'Alāu-d-dīn, and chief lady of Husain Shāh's household was taken captive.*

I have, in the note on this passage in S. I. M. H. Vol. I, 494, pointed out, that when Niẓāmu-d-dīn and Firishta speak of this lady as the حلیلہ or حلیلهٔ جلیلہ of Sulṭān Ḥusain, they mean that she was his 'wife' or 'honoured wife' and that there is no justification for imaginning, as Sir Wolseley Haig does, (C. H. I. III. 231) that Jalīla was her personal name. I may be permitted to cite the following passages to elucidate the meanings of these words.

Budāūnī writes that Ghiyāṣu-d-dīn Tughlaq Shāh punished severely those who had been concerned in marrying Khusrau Khān to the wife of Quṭbu-d-dīn Mubārak.

جمعي را که در عقد حلیلهٔ سلطان قطب‌الدین با خسرو خان متفق بودند بسیاست رسانید

I. 22, *l.* 5.

Elsewhere, he writes that a certain Shaikh of Dehlī named 'Abdu-l-Wāsa', divorced his wife to preserve his honour.

II. 61, *l.* 3 from foot. سر طلاق در گوشہ حلیلہ خود بست

The death of the wife (حلیلہ) of Prince Muḥammad Mu'aẓẓam and the demise of the honoured consorts (حلیلۂ جلیلہ) of Princes Muḥammad Sulṭān and Murād Bakhsh are recorded in the M. 'Ā. 128, *l.* 1, 154 *l.* 9 and *Bādshāhnāma*, II. 137, *l.* 8. The phrase حلیلۂ جلیلہ occurs also in M. U. III. 440, *l.* 3. See also Ma'ṣūm, *Tarīkh-i-Sind*, 84, *l.* 2 ff.

V. 92, *l.* 14. *Sultān Sikandar then pursued his march to Kālpī ...... after which he proceeded to Baksar Chhetra, whose governor, Tātār Khān ...... was confirmed in the government of Chhetra.*

The place is called جہترہ (Jhatra) in the MS of Ni'matullāh's work which is in the Mullā Fīrūz Library (folio 46 a *l.* 8). Dorn calls it 'Kotra' (I. 56), but the Ṭ. A. reads the name as جہترہ (Lith. 160, *l.* 15) and F. has جہترہ (I. 180, *l.* 18).

The place intended *may be* 'Jhatra' or 'Jatāra', now in Orchha State (Constable, Pl. 28 A. c.). It is said to have been renamed Islāmābād by Salīm Shāh Sūr after conquest and is mentioned in the *Āīn.* as one of the *maḥals* of the *Sarkār* of Irich in *Ṣūba* Āgra (II. 188). It is a place of some antiquity and contains an artificial lake called Madan Sāgar which was constructed by the Chandella Rājā Madanavarman, who reigned from about 1129 to 1167 A. C. Lat. 25°-1' N. Long. 79°-6' E. [Luard, Central India State Gazetteer, (Eastern States), Vol. VI A, p. 71].

V. 94, *l.* 8 from foot. *On his way thither [from Sambhal to Shamsābād], he destroyed a place called Pareotākal, the sink and receptacle of marauders aud put to death many of that rebellious gang.*

The name is spelt بدیوناکل in the M. F. L. MS of the *Makhzan*, 47 a, *l.* 7 and مدموناکل, مدیوناکل and دیوناکل in the manuscripts of the *Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī* (B. I. text, I. 318, *l.* 14 = Lith. 161, *l.* 6 from foot). Firishta calls it دیوناری (I. 181, *l.* 10). Dorn has 'Madeomakul' (I. 58).

The place intended *may be* Deonkālī, also called 'Navadeonkālī [نو دیونکلی]. It is now in the Unāo district U. P. and lies about thirty three miles north-west of Unāo town, nineteen miles south-east of Qanauj and about two miles south-east of Bangarmau. It is a place of great antiquity and is now known as Nawal (Unāo District Gazetteer,

Ed. 1903, p. 114; Imp. Gaz. XXIV. 124). Unão district has been, for centuries, the hotbed of Hindu recalcitrance against Muhammadan domination and a focal point or nerve-centre of discontent and disaffection. It continued to bear this character until the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857 (Marshman, History of India II). The town of Unão lies only ten miles north-east of Cawnpore on the opposite side of the river.

V. 95, *l.* 2. *Sultān Sikandar then penetrated to Phaphund belonging to Panna.*

'Panna' is, as I have pointed out in S. I. M. H. Vol. I, 493, a demonstrable error for 'Bhaṭa', but the first name is written سنده in the Ṭ. A. (Lith. 161 last line; B. I. text 1, 318 last line) while F. calls it شهرنو (I, 181, *l.* 13). Briggs turns it into 'Banda' in his translation, but Banda was a place of no note in those times and was a mere village until it became the headquarters of Rājā Gumānsinha, a grandson of Chhatrasāl in the middle of the 18th Century (Banda District Gazetteer—Ed. 1909, p. 209). Firishta and the *Makhzan* have copied the name from the Ṭ. A., where it is called سنده which may perhaps be meant for 'Sehonda'. This place was the principal town of the largest *pargana* in the *sarkār* of Kālinjar in Akbar's reign and was also the seat of civil authority. It lies among ravines close to the river Ken and has fallen from its high estate, but there are ruins sufficient to attest considerable greatness. It is now included in Banda district and situated about twelve miles south of Banda town (*Ibid.* 289, 165). Dorn read the name as 'Behavund' (I. 58) which resembles 'Bandhu'; but it may be read سهوند 'Sehūnd' or 'Sehond' also. It may be worth while to note that in Jarrett's translation of the *Āīn.* (II. 166), the name of the place is spelt 'Sendha' which is exactly the same as the سنده of the Ṭ. A.

V. 99, *l.* 16. *He issued orders for founding the city [of Āgra], when portions of Mauz'a Pashi and Mauz'a Poya, pargana Dūlī, sarkār Bayāna, were occupied for that purpose.*

Of the three villages mentioned one only can be now traced Poya Ghāt—a place of crossing on the Jumna—is mentioned by Budāūnī (II. 54 = Tr. II 51) and still exists. See also Irvine, Later Mughals, I. 21 note. The Urdu *Tārīkh-i-Āgra* (Lith. Fatḥgarh) says that it is near Sulṭānganj.

V. 100, *l.* 14. ***When he [A'ẓam Humāyūn] was on the march, he was attacked by the Rāja of Gwālior in an ambuscade at Chatawar, about ten Kos from that place.***

I am glad to be able to furnish more precise information about this place, than I was able to, in S. I. M. H. Vol. I. 497. The real name is 'Jatāwar' and it lies in the Morena or Tonwarghar district, about 25 miles north-west of Gwālior town. Lat. 26°-32′ N., Long. 77°-57′ E. (Gazetteer of Gwalior State, Vol. I, Part III, p. 53. See also the map in Vol. I, part II.)

V. 114, *l.* 2 from foot. *Sher Shāh issued farmāns to complete the fortifications of Rohtās, but Todar Khatrī represented that the Ghakkars ...... would not allow any one to work for wages.*

The story, as it is related here, is a good illustration of how such tales grow and gather unhistorical accretions in the telling. The original source is the *Tārīkh-i-Sher Shāhī* of 'Abbās Khān. All that he states is that when Rohtās was being built, the overseers complained to Sher Shāh that "stones were not procurable or only procurable at an enormous outlay × × × . Sher Shāh wrote back that × × they should go on with the building though they paid for the stone its weight in copper" (E. D. IV. 419). The gradual reduction of the price of a single stone from a gold *Ashrafī* to a rupee and then to five *tankas* is a fatuously fanciful embellishment which is found only in the *Makhzan.* Todar Mal's name also does not occur in the primary authority. 'Abbās was a contemporary of the Rājā and had no reason for omitting his name or withholding the Kudos, if he had been concerned in the affair. His silence indicates that the association of the Rājā's name with the legend is a later interpolation.

Chronological considerations also point in the same direction. We know that Todar Mal died on 28th Ābān of the XXXIVth year, 8th November 1589 = 9th Muharram 998 H. (A. N. III. 569. Tr. III. 861; B. I. 371 = Tr. II. 383). The year of his birth is not precisely known, but even if he was seventy-five years old at the time, he could have been only 26 in 947 H., when the erection of the fort was begun. Sher Shāh was not free from the bigotry of his day and had no partiality for Hindus. No Hindu is known to have attained high rank in his service or been entrusted with the execution or direction of affairs. If 'Todar Khatrī' had secured a footing anywhere on the official ladder, it must have been on one of its lowest rungs and he must have been, at the most, a clerk or accountant. His name occurs for the first time even in the Akbarī chronicles, only in the ninth year of the great emperor's reign (Ṭ. A. B. I. text, II, 188 last line; E. D. V. 303 and note), no less

than twenty years after Sher Shāh's death. There is no allusion, in any other chronicle, to Todar Mal's connection with the stronghold and even Aḥmad Yādgār ignores it. Indeed, he asserts that the erection of this impregnable military barrier against the Gakkhars was entrusted by Sher Shāh to Haibat Khān Niyāzī (and not to Todar Mal), and that the Khān completed the fort which has no equal, after spending a great amount of money and called it Rohtās.

خان مذکور بزر ریزي آن قلعہ را کہ نظیر ندارد تمام ساختہ رهتاس نام نهاد

205, *l.* 3 from foot.

Among modern writers, Dr. Qānūngo is, perhaps, the only one who has lent credence to the legend, but he has found it impossible to justify his faith in it without pressing into his service two arguments, one of which is really gratuitous assumption or conjecture without proof and the other a demonstrable error of fact. He first postulates that at his death in 998 H., Todar Mal must have been ninety years old, because he was a "temperate and abstemious Hindu", and then asserts that Sher Shāh must have picked him up during his sojourn in the Punjab, as Todar Mal was born at Lāhore (*Op. cit.* 405). The first of these contentions is so feeble as to stand in no need of serious confutation and the second is an old error which subsequent research has exploded. Blochmann proved long ago that Todar Mal was a native of Lāharpūr in Sītāpur district, Oude (Proc. A. S. B. 1871 p. 138; *Ibid*, 1872 p. 35; *Āīn*. tr. I. 620), and Sir George Grierson and other scholars also have stated that the Rājā was a native of the United Provinces (J. A. S. B. 1888, p. 34). There may be a kernel of truth in the statement that the cost of erection was at first considerably enhanced by the difficulty of procuring labour, but the other details are apocryphal, only flowers of fancy added by one or other of the later compilers with a view to enliven the narrative.

V. 145, *l.* 11 from foot. *On hearing this, he resumed his fortitude, and proceeded towards the pass of Sirtūn.*

سرتون is, most probably, a misreading of سبرتو or شبرتو 'Sibr-tū' or 'Shibr-tū'. Jauhar's account shows that this 'Sirtūn' was near the Kipchāq or Chahārdār Pass. The Shibr pass is shown in the map appended to Sir T. Holdich's 'Gates of India'. It lies a few miles north of Bāmiān and south-west of the Kipchāq or Chahārdār pass in (approximate) Lat. 35°–0′ N. and Long. 68°–0′ E. Bābur states that of the seven Hindukush passes which lead from Kābul to Kunduz, Balkh

and Badakhshān, the Shibr-tū, which was reached from Ghorband, was the only one which could be used in the three or four months of winter, as all the others became impassable on account of the rising of the rivers. It is also the lowest of the passes, being only 9800 feet high, while the others are about 11600 to 18900 feet above sea-level (*B. N.* tr. 205 and 204 note). He further states that his brother Nāṣir Mirzā crossed it in his march to and flight from Badakhshān (*Ibid.* 242, 321) and that he himself made use of it on two occasions in 912 H. (*Ibid.* 294, 311).

V. 160, *l.* 8 from foot. *One of the events of this year (436 H.) was that three of the principal Rājās of Hind ...... laid siege to the city of Lāhore.*

There is no reference to these events either in the *Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāṣirī* or the *Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī*, but the narrative is founded on very respectable authority, viz. the *Kāmilu-t-tawārīkh* of Ibna-l-Athīr (Edit. Bulāq IX. 179, *l.* 7). The names of the Rājās, however, are spelt دو بال هرباتر and تابت باری (*ll.* 10, 16).

V. 162, *l.* 7. *One of the places which submitted to the conqueror was the fort of Jūd.*

Sir H. Elliot is not quite correct in stating that the oldest authority for this invasion is the *Rauẓatu-s-Ṣafā*, of Khwānd Mīr (E. D. V. 560-1). That author is indebted for his account to the *Kāmilu-t-tawārīkh* of Ibna-l-Athīr. Of the three places successively attacked, the first is there called, not Jūd, but Ajudhī, and is said to have been 120 *farsakhs* distant from Lahāwar, the second is spoken of as the قلعهٔ روبال (Fort of Rūbāl), and the third *Darrah-i-Nūrah* درهٔ نورهٔ (Edit. Bulāq X. 38, *l.* 2 from foot).

It will be seen that the third name is given by *the primary authority*, as neither 'Dera' nor 'Derāpūr', but as *Darrah-i-Nūrah*, which looks like another form of the *valley* of Nūr (and Qīrāt) in Kāfiristān which Ibrāhīm's ancestor, Maḥmūd also is said to have invaded. In any case, if this reading *Darrah-i-Nūrah* is correct, all the speculative identifications of the place with "Derāband, near Torbela", 'Dehra Dūn', 'Dera' in the valley of the "Indus" and "Navsārī in Gujarāt" are absolutely worthless. The fancied existence of fire-temples and Zoroastrian colonies in Tughlaqpūr and other places in the Punjab is proved to be a myth and a delusion.

It is possible that the 'fort of Rūbāl (or Rūpāl), was so called after the Rājā or ruler, whose name was *Deopāl* (دیوپال). Sir Wolseley Haig's attempt to identify it with 'Rūpāl' in Mahīkānṭhā is so fantastic and far-fetched as not to deserve serious examination. These invasions of India by the armies of Ibrāhīm are, most probably, historical, but this is all that can be said. The names of the places have been so muddled that it is impossible to fix the localities and infructuous to speculate about them.

V. 166, *l.* 2 from foot. *In the same year* [*708 H. = 1308-9 A. C.*], *the fort of Kālwar* [*Jālor*] *came into the possession of 'Alāud-d-dīn's officers.*

But in the *Kānhaḍade prabandha,* an old Gujarātī poem written in Vikrama Saṁvat 1512 (1456 A. C.) by Padmanābha, who was the court-poet of Akhayarāja, the Chauhān prince of Jālor (who was fifth in descent from Kānhaḍadeva), the date of the capture of the stronghold is given as Wednesday, Vaiśākha Śuddha 5, Vikrama Saṁvat 1368 (Edit. Derāsarī, 1926, *Khanḍa* IV, *Ślokas* 291-2, p. 108). The very same date is given in the Rajput chronicle known as 'Muhaṇota Neṇasīrī-Khyāta' (*Ibid.* Introd. p. 21). This date works out to Wednesday, 12th April 1312, according to the Indian Ephemeris.

V. 169, *l.* 9. *At this time, it* [*Garha-Katanga*] *was governed by a woman called Rānī and all the dogs of that country were very faithful and devoted to her.*

The word rendered here as 'dogs' is سکان not سگان. It means 'residents, inhabitants, dwellers'. It occurs in this sense frequently in chronicles. *e. g.*

براعتماد سکان خطه و مقدمان ولایت با جمعی معدود یکایک در بیابان رفت

T. M. 206, *l.* 13.

Niẓāmu-d-dīn Aḥmad tells us that after the birth of prince Murād, Akbar went on pilgrimage to the shrine of the Khwāja of Ajmer and

سکان آن روضهٔ رفیعه را از افضال عام کامیاب و محظوظ ساختند

Lith. 289, *l.* 19; B. I. text II. 229, *l.* 8.

Elsewhere also, he uses the word in connection with the capitulation of the fort of Nagarkot in 981 H. (B. I. text, II, 259, *l.* 11 Lith. 303, *l.* 4 from foot). سکان قلعه حرف صلح درمیان داشتند

This sentence also is wrongly rendered at E. D. V. 358 by Dowson. The word is also used in the Ṭ. A. for the residents of the

town of Fatḥpūr-Sikrī (II. 256, *l.* 10). See also Budāūnī (B. I. text II. 50). Mr. Lowe has rendered it 'people' (Tr. II. 45).

V. 171, *l.* 7. ***Āsaf Khān went under orders to take Rāmpūr.***

This must be Rāmpūr-Bhānpūr, which is now in Indore State. Lat. 24°–28′ N., Long. 75°–27′ E. I. G. XXI 191. It lies about fifty miles south-east of Chitor and was at this time included in the kingdom of Mewār. It is shown in Constable, Pl. 27 Bc; I. G. Atlas, 38 A 2. It is mentioned even in the extracts from the Ṭ. A. also (E. D. V. 326). Bhānpūr is another town in the neighbourhood on the opposite side of the river. Bhānpūr was at this time a place of considerable importance and Sher Shāh had a mint here from which silver coins were issued in 950 H. (Wright, C. M. S. D. 279, 385).

V. 185, *l.* 3. ***The history of the Sharkī dynasty of Jaunpūr, from the commencement of A. H. 784 (A. D. 1382) ...... to the extinction of the monarchy in A. H. 881 (A. D. 1476) when Sultān Husain bin Mahmūd Shāh was defeated by Sikandar bin Bahlūl, king of Dehlī....***

784 H. is a slip for 794 H. (1392 A. C.). The Sulṭān who was reigning in Dehlī in 881 H. was Buhlūl who died only in 894 H. His son, Sikandar was responsible for the final extinction of the monarchy; but that took place only in or after 897—not in 881 H. The error is found in all manuscripts of the *Ṭabaqāt-i-Akbarī* (Rieu, I. 221; Ethé. India Office Catalogue, Col. 96, MS. No. 225). Dowson is not responsible for it.

V. 187, *l.* 4 from foot. ***After he [Mīr Khalīfa] had gone, Mahdī Khwāja continued standing in the pavilion.***

But what the original says is :

چون میرخلیفہ ازخرگاہ مہدی خواجہ بیرون آمد مہدي خواجہ تا در
خرگاہ متابعت نمودہ درمیان درایستادہ

Ṭ. A. B. I. text II. 28, *l.* 8 from foot.

"When Mīr Khalīfa was coming out of the tent of Mahdī Khwāja, the latter followed him upto the door of the pavilion and kept standing in the middle (of the opening)." Mahdī Khwāja was only seeing his honoured visitor to the door of the tent or pavilion, as a mark of respect.

V. 188, *l.* 2 from foot. ***And as the gold was divided by coffers (Kishtī), the date was found in the words Kishti-i-zar.***

Abū-l-Fażl's explanation is very different. He says that Humāyūn "made an excursion upon the river" soon after his coronation and "placing the *barks* of pleasure in the stream of joy, gave away, on that day, a *boatful* of *gold*" (*A. N.* I. 121 tr. I. 286). کشتی means 'boat', as well as 'tray'.

Budāūnī says that "the chronogram was invented because Humāyūn made presents of *trays* filled with gold" (I. 344, tr. I. 451).

V. 190, *l.* 8. *At this time, Sultān Bahādur had marched to besiege Chitor and was carrying on war against Rānā Sānkā.*

Sic. in the Lith. 193, *l.* 3 and B. I. text II. 31, *l.* 9 also; but Rāṇā Sāngā died in 933 H., shortly after his disastrous defeat at Khānwā. He was succeeded by his eldest son Ratanasī who had a short reign of about five years. The Rāṇā, 'at this time', (941 H.) was Ratanasī's younger brother, Vikramājit or Vikramāditya (*Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, text 262, *l.* 11; tr. Bayley, 372; tr. Fażl Luṭfullāh, 179; Erskine, H. B. H. II. 40 note).

V. 194, *l.* 7 from foot. *Humāyūn repaired with six hundred men to this place in Chāmpāner.*

In the note on this passage in S. I. M. H. Vol. I, 506, I have cited a chronogram sponsored by Budāūnī, [نُهم شهر صفر بود] which gives the date of this event as 9th Ṣafar and also the year (942 H.). But the composers of these ingenious trifles are often guilty of arithmetical inexactitudes and some times take liberties with the facts. The rival *Tārīkh* given by Abū-l-Fażl is in the phrase, اول هفته مه صفر. Its letters also not only yield the year 942 (1 + 6 + 30 + 5 + 80 + 400 + 5 + 40 + 5 + 90 + 80 + 200) but also convey the information that the event took place in the first week of Ṣafar.

The standard history of the Sulṭāns of Gujarāt gives the exact date as the 7th of Ṣafar (*Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, text 283, last line). But another provincial chronicler, Abū Turāb Walī, assures us that the fortress was captured on a Friday morning صبح جمعه بود (*Tārīkh-i-Gujarāt*, 24, *l.* 13). If the week-day is given correctly, the Hijra date was 6th Ṣafar, according to the book-rule and may have been 7th by *Rūyyat*, on account of 29 days only having been allotted to Muḥarram. The Julian correspondence was 6th August 1535. The claim of the chronogram, to extraordinary or double ingenuity is not borne out, as the date نُهم is evidently, wrong.

V. 197, *l.* 15. *'So thou art ; but not for thyself'.*

It is not easy to say what Nizāmu-d-dīn really wrote or what Ghazanfar actually said, as the MSS vary. The B. I. text reads it thus :

II. 38, *l.* 6 from foot. هستي اما خوش مستي

'Yes you are, but you are quite drunk'. Ahmad Yādgār has copied all this from the T. A. and the words are written in two MSS just as in the B. I. text, but the reading favoured by another copy is اما خود نيستى 'But you are not yourself', *i. e.* you are not in your right senses (B. I. text 145, *l.* 8). F.'s reading is اما خويش نيستي (I. 216, *l.* 3). Mr. Erskine understood the words to mean, "he is not himself" or "he is not self-governed" (H. B. H. II. 84 and note). Blochmann's rendering is "Thou art drunk, and has lost thy senses". *Āīn.* tr. I. (reprint), 372. The M. U. reads the words thus : مستى و با خويشتن نيستى (III. 200, *l.* 2), that is, 'You are drunk and are not your ownself'.

V. 199, *l.* 7 from foot. *To curb his [Sher Khān's] proceedings, the emperor [Humāyūn] marched against him on 14th Safar 942 H. (12th August 1535).*

The year is wrongly given. It should be 944 H. See the note on E. D. IV. 349, footnote, in this supplement. Hindāl's rebellion also is put two years too early in 943 H. on p. 201, *l.* 3 from foot. Read 945 H. Humāyūn was engaged in conquering or rather over-running Gujarāt in 942 H. As he is said to have returned at the end of that year and to have stayed there for a year, he could not have started on his expedition to the east before 944 H.

V. 207, *l.* 6. *Mirzā Yādgār Nāsir had pitched his camp about two miles below the royal camp.*

The Lith. (T. A. 204, *l.* 1) and the B. I. text (II. 48, *l.* 14) and Budāūnī (I. 437 = tr. I. 560) read دهكوس that is, '*ten kos*', which must be correct. Humāyūn is said to have had about a hundred thousand men altogether with him and the two camps could not have been in such close proximity to each other.

V. 211, Footnote 1, *l.* 3. *Thence, he [Humāyūn] proceeded to Pahlūdī, thirty Kos from Joudhpūr, and afterwards made three forward marches to the tank of Jūkī. Akbar-nāma, Vol. I. p. 219.*

This 'tank of Jūkī' has not been traced. It is meant for some such name as 'Jogī-talāo'. I understand from a local authority that

there is still a place called 'Jogī-tīrtha', about eight miles north-east of Jodhpūr town. In Stewart's translation of Jauhar also, it is called 'the pond of Jogi' (reprint 1904, p. 55).

V. 216, *l.* 5 from foot. *Haidar Muhammad Akhtar-begī.*

Correctly, 'Ākhtabegī', 'Master of the geldings', آختہ means "a gelding, a castrated, tamed or managed horse" (Richardson). آختا جیان is used in the Ṭ. A. (B. I. text II. 53, *l.* 6 from foot) and is rendered 'equerries' by Dowson (E. D. V. 212). A shorter form, *Ākhta* is attached, on p. 232 of these extracts, to the name of Pīr Muḥammad (Akhtā), (correctly, *Ākhta*). The *Ākhtabegī* was, 'the superintendent of the department', the *Ākhtajī* one of the subordinates or grooms who "looked after the harness and had the horses saddled" (*Āīn.* tr. I, reprint 145 and 477 n.), 'Akhtarbegī' would, if it had any meaning, signify 'master of the stars' !

The 'Ākhtabegī' must have been one of the great dignitaries as Mun'im Khān is said to have left Kābul in charge of this Ḥaidar Muḥammad when he himself was summoned to Āgra after the fall of Bairām (Ṭ. A. Lith. 259, *l.* 9; E. D. V. 280).

V. 220, *l.* 13 from foot. *Munawwar Beg, son of Mīr Beg, escaped from the fortress.*

The Lith. and the B. I. text give the father's name as Nūr Beg (211, *l.* 1 and II. 62, *l.* 9 from foot) and the A. N. agrees with them (I. 234 = tr. I. 466). Nūr Beg was one of Bābur's followers and is frequently mentioned in his Memoirs (B. N. tr. 395, 418, 653, 673, 688–9).

V. 223, *l.* 6 from foot. *The Emperor, passing over the heel of the Hindū-Koh, encamped at Sher-gīrān.*

Abū-l-Faẓl calls it 'Tīrgirān' and says it is one of the villages of Andarāb (A. N. I. 251 = tr. I. 491). Aḥmad Yādgār who has copied the whole chapter almost word for word from the Ṭ. A. has کران (B. I. text II. 314, *l.* 8). Major Stewart reads it as 'Tyrgeran' (Jouhar, *Tezkereh al Vakiat*, Edi. 1832, p. 84; reprint. 123), but Erskine calls it 'Tirkerān' (History of Baber and Humāyūn, II. 329). Perhaps, the right reading here is *Shuturgrām* شترگرام which is mentioned at p. 232. *q. v.* my note.

It also was near Andarāb and شترگرام can be easily misread or miswritten as شیرگران or تیرگران. The suggestion is substantially reinforced by the fact that in the manuscripts of the Ṭ. A. used by the editor of the Bibl. Ind. text the place is called شترگران. We read :

اردو از عقب هندو کوه گذشتم در شترگران نزول فرمود

II. 65, *l.* 2 from foot.

V. 223, *l.* 5 from foot. *Mirzā Sulaimān ...... fled into the Kohistān of Dūrdasht.*

بکوهستان دور دشت گریخت

T. A. B. I. text II. 66, *l.* 1; Lith. 212, *l.* 7 from foot.

But Ahmad Yādgār who has copied the whole passage from the T. A. has دوردست 'distant, remote, far-off'. What Abū-l-Fazl states is that the Mirzā fled to "the defiles of Khost by way of Narīn and Ishkamish" (*A. N.* I. 252, tr. I. 492). Erskine (H. B. H. II. 329) follows Abū-l-Fazl. As no hilly region specifically known as 'Dūrdasht' has been or can be traced, دوردست *may be* right.

V. 224, *l.* 7. *The royal army then moved on to the neighbourhood of the fort of Zafar.*

This place does not now exist, though it is mentioned frequently in Bābur's Memoirs (*B. N.* tr. 21. 242, 545, 618, 621). He informs us that its real name was 'Shāf Tīwār' and that it was renamed 'Qil'a Zafar' by Mubārakshāh Muzaffarī, a descendant of the old kings of Badakhshān, when he reconquered it from the Uzbegs in or about 910 H. (*Ibid*, 242; Erskine's tr. 167). Its ruins may be still seen on the left bank of the Kokcha, a little below the mouth of the Argū river and above that of the Teshkān stream, about 260 miles n. e. of Kābul and about 30 miles north-east of Tālīqān (*Tar. Rash.* tr. 220 note; *B. N.* tr. 21, 621 and notes; see the map in Yule's edition of Wood's Journey. Lat. 37° N. Long 70° E. approximately).

V. 225, *l.* 5. *Humāyūn crossed the river in the valley of Zuhāk and drove before him Sher 'Alī who resisted to the best of his power. Humāyūn then safely crossed the Shakī.*

آن حضرت از آب دره بضحاک آمدند و شیرعلی حسب المقدور جنگ
کرده ملهزم گشت و لشکر از تنگی بسلامت عبور نمود

Lith. 213. *l.* 11; B. I. text, II. 67, *l.* 10.

"His Majesty marched from *Ābdarra* to Zuhāk and Sher 'Alī was routed, after having fought according to his strength, and the army crossed the *Tangī* (narrow pass) in safety".

'Ābdarra' does not mean 'river in the valley'. It is the specific name of a defile leading up to the Shibra-tū or Shibr *pass*, from the northern side. It is not shown in recent maps, but Yule states that

"the Hindu-Kush pass of Shibr lies at the extremity of the axis of the Ghorband valley and descends upon the Bāmiān branch of the Surkhāb, at the ruins of Zohāk. It was the pass most frequently traversed by Bāber who calls it *Shibratū*". According to him, it was the only pass never closed in winter, and in that season when the waters were low, it was possible to go from it direct to Madr on the Khulm road by the *Ābdarrah*, which I take to be the upper valley of the Surkhāb, below Zohāk (Wood's Oxus, Edit. 1872, Introd. p. LXV; see also *B. N.* tr. 205, 242, 321). Bābur himself used it when he went to Qunduz in 915 H. (1510 A. C.) on hearing of the death of Shaibānī Khān (*B. N.* tr. 351). See also *A. N.* tr. I. 504 note; Erskine, H. B. H. II. 337; *Tārīkh-i-Rashīdī*, tr. 237 note. The name probably means valley or defile of the river آب (Surkhāb) and is found elsewhere also. Abū-l-Fazl mentions a defile called Ābdarra "between Bānū and Darsamand (north of Thal and south-west of Peshāwar), from which the Bangash river emerges" (*A. N.* III. 520, tr. III. 794 and note).

Raverty explains that a "*darra* signifies an opening more or less broad, between two mountains or ranges of mountains, through which a stream generally flows and through which opening in the river's bed, or at its side, a way lies. A *darra* may be well compared to a leaf, the river and the feeders being the skeleton" (Notes on Afghanistan p. 7; see also *ibid*, 48 note). In the *Akbarnāma* (text I. 260, *l.* 16) Abū-l-Fazl makes the matter quite clear. He says that "Humāyūn marched by the pass of Shibr-tü. × × × Sher 'Alī × × had strongly fortified the Ābdarra defile × × ×

شیر علی تنگی آب دره را عظیم محکم کرده بود

fled × × but when the victorious cortége had passed through he fell upon the baggage and tents" (*A. N.* tr. I. 504–5).

V. 225, *l.* 9. ***Next day, a great battle was fought, in the lines of Yūrt-jālāk.***

در النگ یرت چالاک جنگ عظیم شد

B. I. text, II. 67, *l.* 14; Lith. 213, *l.* 14.

This *Alang*-i-Chālāk or *Yūrt*-i-Chālāk is a meadow about a mile or two northwest of Kābul. It is of considerable extent, but Bābur complains that it is infested by mosquitoes which greatly annoy the horses (*B. N.* tr. 201, 204; *A. N.* I. 274, 285, tr. I. 525, 543 and notes). Jahāngīr says he visited the Alang-Yūrt of Chālāk, when he was in

Kābul in the 2nd year of his reign, and found it a very pleasant place (T. J. text 52, *l.* 25; tr. I. 109). 'Yurt' or 'Urta' is said to mean 'middle' in Turkī. There is a Urta-Bāgh also in Kābul (Beveridge J. A. S. B. 1898, p. 308). Chālāk or 'Jalak' is most probably a Turkī word and has nothing to do with the Persian چالاک sprightly.

V. 226, *l.* 13. *Kāsim Husain Sultān brought a body of the men of Sarm Tughā as a reinforcement from Kandahār.*

The name is spelt شرم طغائی in the B. I. text II. 68 last line. The correct name is probably شیرم Sherim, a familiar or affectionate form of شیر. Cf. Shāhim, Nūrim, Mīrim, Māhim, Khojim. A Sherim Taghāī, who was the uncle of Bābur's mother, is mentioned more than once in that emperor's Memoirs (*B. N.* 29, 91, 98, 119, 141). Mirzā Haidar calls him Shirun Ṭaghāī (*Tār. Rashīdī.* tr. 228). See also *A. N.* I. 87, tr. I. 225 and note; Erskine, H. B. H., I. 334. The name of Sherim, the chuhra (brave) also occurs in the *Bāburnāma* (tr. 244). Dowson is mistaken in inserting 'Sarm Tughā' in his geographical index. It is not the name of a place but of a person.

V. 227, *l.* 2. *Kāmrān then called out in the Turkī language, 'I have killed your father, Bābā Kashaka.'*

Sic in the Lith. 214, *l.* 14, but the B. I. text turns it just the other way and interjects a negative.

پدر تو بابا قشقہ را من بقتل نہ آوردہ ام

Ṭ. A. II. 69, *l.* 5 from foot.

'I have *not* killed your father, Bābā Qashqa' *i. e.* 'I have given you no just cause for taking vengeance'. Mr. Beveridge takes almost the same view and thinks that Kāmrān "*ironically* asked Ḥājjī if he had killed his father, that he should be so keen in pursuing him" (*A. N.* tr. I. 515 note).

The princess Gulbadan informs us that Bābā Qashqa was killed by Muḥammad Zamān Mirzā, some time after Humāyūn's accession (*H. N.* 29, *l.* 3; trans. 114). Kāmrān's remark thus becomes intelligible and shows that the negative is right. The M. U. also inserts it in its version of the incident (I. 394).

Ḥājjī Muḥammad's repeated backslidings and acts of perfidy in the struggle between the brothers are explained by the fact that he was the *Koka* of Kāmrān and not of Humāyūn. Erskine (H. B. H. II. 344 note) understands it very differently.

V. 227, *l*. 7. ***The horses and asses of the enemy fell into the hands of the victor.***

The words in the text are اسپ و یراق (B. I. text, II. 70, *l*. 8; Lith. 214, *l*. 5 from foot) and signify 'horses and arms or accoutrements'. The collocation اسپ و یراق occurs in Budāūnī (I. 316, *l*. 5) for a horse and his trappings or housings.

Khwāfī Khān speaks of اسلحہ و یراق جنگ (B. I. text II. 922, *l*. 2). Elsewhere, we find چیرہ و یراق بستن (*ibid*. II. 867, *l*. 13) and Dowson renders it, "putting on turbans and armour" (E. D. VII. 492). See also Ṭ. A. (B. I. text II. 268, *l*. 11; 290, *l*. 5); Budāūnī, I. 458, *l*. 9; M. U. II. 811, *l*. 10.

The *Ghiyāṣu-l-lughāt* states that it means اسلحۂ سپاہ soldiers' arms, *e. g*. swords, bows and arrows, shields, etc. and also سامان و اسباب و مصالح ہر چیز "goods and materials and requisites for all sorts of things". The M. U. states that Khān-i-Daurān presented to Shāh Jahān a very fine elephant with housing of gold فیل با یراق طلا (I. 755, *l*. 10).

V. 227, *l*. 20. ***Pīr Muhammad followed his own inclination and came to Badakhshān.***

پیر محمد خان بنفس خود بامداد میرزا بہ بدخشان آمد

Lith. 214, *l*. 4 from foot; B. I. text II. 70, *l*. 10.

"And Pīr Muḥammad *personally* came to Badakhshān for assisting Mirzā Kāmrān".

Abū-l-Faẓl states that "Pīr Muḥammad accompanied Kāmrān to Badakhshān" (*A. N*. I. 272, tr. 521). See also Erskine H. B. H. II. 347. Cf. حضرت بنفس اقدس از دار الخلافت فتحپور حرکت فرمودہ

Ṭ. A. B. I. text II. 324, *l*. 2 from foot. Elsewhere, we read that خلفاي اربعہ بنفس خویش خطبہ میخواندند (*ibid*. 344, *l*. 4)

In still another place we meet with the phrases

حضرت بذات اقدس و نفس مقدس (*ibid*. II. 242, *l*. 15)

and حضرت ... بنفس نفیس از آب سند سالم گذشتہ (*ibid*. 360, *l*. 15).

V. 228, *l*. 2. ***They drove off the royal flocks (galah) which were in Khwāja Riwāj.***

This was a place near Kābul. It appears to have been situated somewhere between the Sūngqūrghān meadow, which lay about four miles (two *karoh*) north-east of Kābul and the Yūrt-i-Chālāk meadow,

which was some two miles north-west of the city (*B. N.* tr. 204 and 345 = Erskine's tr. 138 and 234).

Mrs. Beveridge thinks that the name may have been derived from some shrine in the *Riwāj* (Rhubarb) fields in the vicinity (*ibid.* 245 note). Abū-l-Faẓl states that 'Khwāja Rivāsh' was within two *kos* of Kābul (*A. N.* II. 184 = tr. II. 286).

V. 229, *l.* 16. *Kāmrān begged forgiveness for Mānūs Beg, but sent the other Amirs.*

و میرزا کامران گناه با بوس بیگ را درخواست نمود و دیگرامرا را بملازمت فرستاد

Lith. 215, *l.* 2 from foot; B. I. text II. 72, *l.* 11.

Abū-l-Faẓl says that what Kāmrān wrote was, "Entreat His Majesty to suffer Bābūs to go along with me, for he is an old servant, and I am desirous of atoning to him on this journey for what I have done to him" (*A. N.* I. 279, tr. I. 535). Bāyazīd Bīyāt gives the matter a different turn and states that "Kāmrān wanted to take Bābūs to Mecca to obtain absolution for his crimes and that Humāyūn agreed, saying that he did not want cuckolds in his camp (*ibid.* note 2). The gravamen of his offence was that though Humāyūn had been extraordinarily good and kind to him and Kāmrān so inhuman as to order his wife to be violated and his sons killed, he had gone over to Kāmrān and been false and disloyal to Humāyūn. Such a spiritless creature —one so lost to all sense of honour fully deserved the opprobrious epithet دیوس (cuckold) which rhymes to بابوس (H. B. H. II. 342).

V. 229, *l.* 19. *Mirzā Kāmrān proceeded out of the fort, and went to the distance of a parasang, but when he was no longer in apprehension of any harm from the superior power of Humāyūn, he was greatly ashamed and turned back with the resolve of paying allegiance to him.*

This is not very lucidly expressed and is not easy to follow.

What Niẓāmu-d-dīn says is

وچون گمان نداشت که آن حضرت باوجود قدرت اورا بحال خود گذارد، وازین مرحمت بغایت شرمسار شد و عزیمت ملازمت آن حضرت نموده مراجعت کرد

Lith. 215 last line; B. I. text II. 72, *l.* 14.

"And as he never imagined that His Majesty would leave him unmolested [*i. e.* would not pursue and take him prisoner] when he had the actual power to do so, he was so greatly put to shame by this merciful forbearance, that he determined to make submission and returned."

Firishta makes the meaning quite clear.

گمان ندا شتند کہ آن حضرت فوجی بتعاقب ایشان نفرستد و آن حضرت نفرستاد ازین مرحمت بغایت شرمندہ شد

I. 239, *l.* 10.

"And as they never imagined that His Majesty would not send an army after them in pursuit, and did not do so, they were greatly ashamed etc."

V. 230, *l.* 19. ***Humāyūn declared his opinion that as the invasion of Balkh had been undertaken, it should be prosecuted in full confidence.***

آن حضرت فرمودند کہ چون عزیمت این یورش تصمیم یافت توکل کردہ میرویم

Lith. 216, *l.* 12; B. I. text II. 73, *l.* 11.

"His Majesty said, 'As this campaign has been deliberately resolved upon, we are marching in full reliance upon Divine assistance'.

"The Afghans," writes Elphinstone, "make a merit of their "Towukkul beh Khooda", or reliance upon God, before they commence any undertaking. × × × It is common with them to encourage a person to embark in a difficult adventure by saying 'Towukkul beh Khooda koon o boorow'—'Put your trust in God and go on'." (Account of the Kingdom of Caubul, Ed. 1839, I. 293). The 'confidence' was confidence *in God*, not in himself or in his followers. توکل is 'trust in or dependence upon some agency other than human, when one is unable to determine for himself'. Niẓāmu-d-dīn writes elsewhere that

میرزا سلیمان متوکلا علي الله تعالي رو براہ هندوستان آورد

Ṭ. A. II. 314, *l.* 10.

When he was deserted at the very first stage by the escort provided by Mirzā Muḥammad Ḥakīm, "Mirzā Sulaimān turned his face towards Hindustān *in reliance only on God, the* Most High."

Lieut. Conolly also speaks of his companions resolving to go on 'Tewokul be Khoda', although there was some danger (Journey to the North of India, I. 230).

V. 231, *l.* 13. ***Durra Gaz is on the road to Kâbul, so friends and foes ...... imagined that a retreat to Kābul was intended.***

The name signifies 'the valley of the tamarisk' or 'valley of Manna' (*B. N.* tr. 14). Several species of Tamarisk exude a sweet, gummy substance which solidifies into small hard drops in the cold of early morning and is known as گزبگین or گزنگین tamarisk-honey. This valley lies on the Dehas or Balkh-āb (Balkh-river), about fifty miles south of Balkh. It is shown in the map attached to Yule's edi-

tion of Wood's Journey. Lat. 36°–10′ N. Long. 67°–10′ E. (approximately).

V. 232, *l.* 1 from foot. ***In the mountains, he was met by Mirzā Kāmrān, Karācha Khān and the forces of Kābul.***

و در مابین عقبه و اشتر کرام میرزا کامران باقراچه خان و لشکر کابل در برابر آمده

Lith. 217, *l.* 6 from foot; B. I. text II. 76, *l.* 7.

"And between the Pass and Ishterkrām, Mirzā Kāmrān came out to oppose him with Qarācha Khān and the army of Kābul."

But the Lith. leaves out the conjunction, which means that this trial of strength between the brothers took place, not between the *pass* and Ishtergrām, but in the middle of the pass *of* Ishtergrām (217, *l.* 6 from foot).

As the point is not without significance, it may be worthwhile to cite the *Tārīkh-i-Alfī* which uses the very same words and deliberately omits the conjunction.

و در مابین عقبهٔ اشترگرام میرزا کامران باقرچه خان و لشکر کابل برابر امده
و از طرفین صف آرائي کردند

Manuscript in the Mullā Fīrūz Library, Bombay, Annals of 957 H.

Abū-l-Faẓl's account is that "when the grand army *came near Ushtar-Grām*, Kāmrān made preparations for war and marched against it" (*A. N.* I. 303 = tr. I. 568; see also *ibid.* 307 = tr. 574). Gulbadan also speaks of this battle (of Ishtergrām) having been fought near Chārīkārān (*H. N.* 91, *l.* 8 = tr. 195). But the name assumes a different form elsewhere.

"On Thursday, the king marched from Anderāb and encamped on the skirts of the mountain of Hindū Kush; the next day he marched to Penjchehereh (now Penjsheher), thence to *Shutergerden*, where he found his brother Kāmrān drawn up to oppose him" (Jauhar, tr. Stewart, Ed. 1832, p. 99). Here 'Shutergerden' takes the place of 'Ishter*gram*'.

Mr. Erskine perplexes the matter still further. "Humāyūn", he writes, "having surmounted the northern slope of the Hindū Kush, descended into the valley of Penjshīr and Ashterkerām. On arriving near Shutergerden, he saw the army of Kāmrān drawn up in a line right in the line of march" (H. B. H. II. 390–1). It is difficult to accept both these names as correct. Mr. Erskine seems to have thought it advisable to incorporate them both in his narrative, as there was authority for the one as well as for the other, in his sources. He tried to

reconcile the discrepant names by supposing that 'Ishtergrām' was the name of the town, and 'Shutargarden' that of the pass, and that the site of the battle lay somewhere between the two localities. But there is no warrant for any such supposition or distinction in the chronicles themselves. Names beginning with 'Shutur' or 'Ushtur' are not uncommon in Afghānistān and Central Asia. Shuturgardan, 'Camel's Neck' is just the right name for a steep and crooked ascent. The name occurs in connection with Shaibānī Khān's siege of Samarqand in 906 H. (*B. N.* tr. 142) and a Shutargardan pass, about 10800 feet above sea-level, is shown in Constable's Atlas Pl. 24 C a in Lat. 34°-5′ N. Long. 69°-25′ E. But it lies about 60 miles south-east of Kābul and not anywhere near Andarāb, Panjshīr and Chārīkārān. A place called 'Ushtur-shahr' also is frequently mentioned in Bābur's Memoirs, (B. N. tr. 195, 294, 314), but it was situated between Ghorband and fort Ẕuhāq in Lat. 35°-0′ N. Long. 68°-0′ E. (approximately), about 60 miles north-west of Kābul. The Shutargrām or Ushtargram, we are in search of, was, by all accounts, a town or defile (named after it) in the vicinity of Andarāb. It is not shown on recent maps, but Sayyid Ghulām Muḥammad, an agent of Warren Hastings who passed through the district, states that he proceeded from Chārīkār to Tutandarra, seven *Kos* to the north, then to Deh Afghāna ten *Kos* west of Tutandarra, then to *Ushtargrōm*, ten *Kos* to the south-west, then to Sāfī, thirteen *Kos* to the south-west, and then to Nijrāo, ten *Kos* to the south (Raverty, Notes on Afghanistan, 142).

Bāyazīd Bīyāt also mentions it in connection with Humāyūn's return to Kābul from the abortive expedition to Balkh in 1548. He says that the emperor marched from Nāran (or Nārīn) to Pariān and lost his way on coming from Pariān to the pass of *Ushtar-Karām* (Mr. Beveridge's summary in J. A. S. B. 1898, p. 303). Tutandarra and Nijrāo are shown north of Chārīkār in the map of the 'Passes of the Hindū Kush' which is attached to Sir Clements R. Markham's article in the Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society for 1879.

V. 233, *l.* 3. ***Kāmrān was defeated, and fled to the mountains of Mandrūd.***

مندرور in the B. I. text II. 76, *l.* 11; the last letter is 'rā' not 'dāl'.

It is 'Mandrawar', about ten miles south of Lamghān and north of Jagdalik. Abū-l-Fazl states that Kāmrān fled in the disguise of a qalandar to Muḥammad of Mandraur, one of the leading men of the Lamghānāt (*A. N.* I. 307, tr. I. 574). It is the Mandrawar of Constable, Pl. 22 D c.

V. 233, *l.* 14. ***Then in concert with the Afghāns of Mūhmand, the Khail of Dāūdzāī and the chiefs of Lamghān, Kāmrān went off towards Sind.***

واو ... با نفاق افغانان مهمند و خليل و داود زيي و ملكان لمغانات بطرف سنده گريخت

B. I. text II. 76, *l.* 3 from foot. The Lith. has خيل داودى 218, *l.* 3.

"And he, with the assistance of the Afghān (tribes) of Mahmand and Khalīl and Dāūdzaī and the Maliks of the Lamghānāt fled to Sind".

Jauhar, according to Stewart's translation, states that Kāmrān "had taken refuge with the Afghān chief, Muhammed Khelyl" (p. 101). 'Khalīl' is undoubtedly the right reading. See also Raverty's Notes on Afghanistan 54, 46, 220, 257. He explains that the Mahmand, Khalīl, Dāūdzaī, Zerānī and Chamkānī are the five tribes constituting the Ghwārī or Ghwariah Khel or sept (*ibid.* 121 and note). Firishta (I. 247, *l.* 17) and the *Tārīkh-i-Alfī* (Mullā Fīrūz Library Ms—Events of 959 H.) give the names as Khalīl and Dāūdzaī and Abū-l-Faẓl also declares that Kāmrān "sought protection with the Afghān tribes of Khalīl and Mohmand (*A. N.* I. 375 = tr. I. 575).

V. 237, *l.* 5 from foot. *The Afghāns began the battle with their archers, but as it was getting dark, the arrows took little effect on the Mughals, but the Afghāns being greatly annoyed by the fire (ātishī), threw themselves into a neighbouring village.*

As most of the houses in the villages of Hindustān are thatched, a fire broke out and lighting up the field of battle, the (Mughal) archers came out and plied their weapons by the light of the burning village.

The whole account is topsy-turvied and the point of the story missed and entirely obscured or lost in the translation.

مغولان آغاز كمانداري كردند و بواسطهٔ ظلمت شب تيراندازان مغول مرئي نميشدند افغانان از غايت اضطراب آتشي در موضعي كه نزديك بود انداختند

Lith. 220, *l.* 14; B. I. text II. 81, *l.* 8 from foot.

"The *Mughals* [not the Afghāns] began to shoot with their bows, but as on account of the darkness of the night, the Mughal archers could not be seen clearly enough to be aimed at [by their opponents, the Afghāns], the latter who were greatly perturbed [in consequence of the ineffectiveness of their archery] set fire to a village which lay in the vicinity".

Dowson has wrongly inserted an *iẓāfut* after اضطراب. "*The Afghāns were not annoyed by the fire* (*ātishī*)", but set fire (*ātishī andākhtand*) to the village with a view to make their invisible foes easy targets for their own arrows. But this manoeuvre recoiled upon themselves and the light or glare of the flames only enabled their adversaries to make more deadly execution with their bows. In fact, Niẓāmu-d-dīn quotes the following couplet to illustrate the fact that it was a case of the 'Biter bit'.

همان کہ دام همی ساخت بستہ گشت بدام - همان کہ چاہ همی کند در فتاد بچاہ

Ṭ. A. II. 81, last two lines.

'He who spread the net, was himself ensnared in it; he who dug the well fell into it himself.'

Jauhar's account is that "the Afghāns having, in their retreat, set fire to some villages, enabled our troops by the light of the fire to pierce them with our arrows" (Stewart, 114; reprint, 167). The proverb is quoted by him also in another connection (Stewart, 105). cf. Abū-l-Faẓl, *A, N.* I. text 345; tr. I. 626.

V. 238, *l.* 6 from foot. *The Afghāns, 100000 in number, were defeated, being inferior in courage, and (Sulṭān) Sikandar fled.*

افغانان کہ قریب صد هزار کس بودند از اندک مردمی شکست یافتند

B. I. text II. 82 last line; Lith. 221, *l.* 6.

"They were routed by a small number of men though they were nearly one hundred thousand (in number)".

In speaking of the defeat of a large army of Māladeva by a small troop of Humāyūn, Niẓāmu-d-dīn writes:

و لشکر عظیم از اندک مردم گریزان شدند

Ṭ. A. B. I. text II. 54, *l.* 12 = E. D. V. 213.

The phrase occurs again at Ṭ. A. II. 70, *l.* 4; 75, *l.* 14 in the same sense. See also *ibid.* 197, *l.* 2; 213, *l.* 6 from foot and 253, *l.* 2 from foot, where مردمی is employed for 'men, persons, individuals'.

V. 240, *l.* 9 from foot. *He was particular about his ablutions.*

Lith. 222, *l.* 9; B. I. text II. 85, *l.* 4. در کل حال باوضو بودی

"And he always (lit. in all conditions) kept himself ceremonially pure, *i. e.* he took care to repeat the *Waẓū* or ablution, whenever there was any reason to believe that ceremonial uncleanness had been contracted.

Waẓū is an ablution, made in a minutely prescribed form, before the recitation of any of the obligatory or supererogatory prayers. "It

is nullified," according to the *Qanoon-e-Islam*, "if the body is defiled × × by obeying a call of nature, *crepitus ventris*, having a discharge of blood or matter in any part of the body, vomiting, sleeping, fainting or even laughing loudly or immoderately during prayers. Any of these is sufficient to contaminate a person and *wuzoo* is rendered indispensable; until the performance of which it is not lawful for him to engage in prayer" (Tr. Herklots, Edit. of 1822, p. 74).

The religious merit of being always in the state of *waẓū*, that is, of renewing the rite of purification, whenever the occasion arises, is believed to be exceedingly great (Sell, Faith of Islam, 254). Baranī in extolling the virtues of Sulṭān Balban states that he was never without *waẓū* وبی وضو اصلا نبودی (T. F. 46, *l.* 12) and Shams-i-Sirāj reckons it as one of the felicities of Khān Jahān, that he had, under the spiritual guidance of Shaikh Naṣīru-d-dīn Chirāgh-i-Dehlī acquired the same habit.

T. F. 423, *l.* 5 from foot. دائم باوضو بودی

Aurangzeb is said to have been equally punctilious and to have done his best to acquire the same ثواب (Maāsir-i- '*Ālamgīrī*). Shāhbāz Khān Kambū and Muḥammad Khān Niyāzī were never بی وضو (M. U. II. 599, *l.* 2; III. 375 last line).

V. 247, *l.* 3 from foot. *The Ilāhī is a true solar year beginning with the Nauroz.*

The words used are سال شمسی حقیقی and the meaning is that the length of the year was taken to be 365 days, 5 hours, 45 minutes and 27 seconds, as it had been determined in the *Zīch-i-Jadīd* or *Zīch-i-Gurgānī* of the astronomer-king, Mirzā Ulugh Beg (*Āīn.* text I. 274, *l.* 21; tr. Jarrett. II. 24).

V. 249, *l.* 3. *He [Tardī Beg] also, with the help of Khwāja Sultān 'Alī, Wazīr and Mīr Munshī, who was also Mīr-i-'arz and Mīr-i-māl, kept under control the affairs of Dehlī, and of Mewāt.*

This is obscurely expressed. Tardī Beg had not one, but two coadjutors or assistants : (1) Khwāja Sulṭān 'Alī who was the Wazīr and (2) Muḥammad Aṣghar, who had been appointed to the post of Mīr *Munshī* by *Humāyūn* (Ṭ. A. B. I. text II. 153, *l.* 2 from foot). Sulṭān 'Alī was made *Wazīr* in 9—(A. N. I. 292; tr. I. 552).

Muḥammad Aṣghar was the Mīr Munshī and was also in charge of the *Dīwān-i-'Arẓ* and the *Dīwān-i-Māl.* Sulṭān 'Alī was not *Wazīr*, as well as *Mīr Munshī*, *Mīr-i-'arẓ* and *Mīr-i-māl*, as Dowson's words

would imply. Budāūnī clearly distinguishes between the two men and speaks of them as Sulṭān 'Ālī, Wazīr Khān and the Mīr Munshī, Ashraf Khān (text II. 12; tr. II. 5).

V. 249, last line. *So he [Munim Khān] consented that the name of Mirzā Sulaimān should be mentioned in the list of the titles (Zail-i-alkāb) of His Majesty the Emperor.*

It would be better to say, "below or at the foot or lowest part, *i. e.* the end of the recitation of Akbar's titles.

It seems that this was to be done only *once* یکبار as the Ṭ. A. explicitly states (B. I. text II. 129, *l.* 1). Lowe has misunderstood the word as 'at once' (Budāūnī, tr. II. 5). Abū-l-Faẓl says that "Mun'im Khān gave permission to have the Khuṭba recited in one of the mosques and in the presence of a few persons" (*A. N.* II. 25; tr. II. 43). Bāyazīd Biyāt who was in Kābul at the time and "took a prominent part in repelling the attack", states that "a compromise was made whereby Sulaimān's *Imām* was allowed to read the *Khuṭba* in his name *for one day*" (J. A. S. B. 1898, Part I. p. 309). It was agreed to by both parties, merely because it served the purpose of both and saved the faces also of both. The siege had lasted too long for either combatant.

V. 251, *l.* 7. *But although Hīmūn had, thus, by his tactics and artifice, prevailed over Tardī Beg Khān, he did not think of pursuing him.*

This is a downright travesty of the real meaning.

هیمون این صورت را بر مکر و خداع تردي بیک خان حمل کرده بتعاقب او نم پرداخت

Ṭ. A. B. I. text II. 130, *l.* 10.

"And Hīmūn, attributing this to stratagem and deceit on the part of Tardī Beg Khān, did not exert himself in pursuing him." The 'tactics and artifice' are predicated of Tardī Beg and not of Hīmūn. The latter imagined that Tardī Beg's retreat or flight was only feigned and that his design was to turn round upon his pursuers and attack them at the proper time from a point of vantage. The discomfiture of the Chaghatāīs had been brought about, not by any cunning or "artifice" practised by 'Adalī's Hindu favourite, but by chance or accident and the irresistible charge of the heavy brigade of his 'fierce elephants'. Budāūnī says that Hemū attacked Tardī Beg and in a single charge swept him before him, but he turned back for fear of treachery and did not pursue the Mughals" (text II. 13, *l.* 5 from foot; tr. II. 6). Abū-l-Faẓl declares that "Hemū regarded this strange event [Tardī Beg's

flight] as a trick of his enemy, and so did not pursue Tardī Beg Khān" (A. N. II. 31; tr. II. 50).

V. 251 last line. *When the royal standards were pitched, 'Alī Kulī Khān and .... were sent forward with the advanced force.*

چون رایات جلال بحدود سرای گردیده انتصاب یافت

Lith. 245, *l.* 3; B. I. text II. 131, *l.* 6.

"When the Imperial standards were pitched near the Sarāī of *Gardīdah*".

This گردیده is a ludicrous distortion of 'Garaunda' گرونده. It is the 'Gharaunda' in Karnāl district, Punjab (Constable, Pl. 25 B c). It lies just ten miles north of Pānīpat. Abū-l-Faẓl says that "the world-adorning standards cast the rays of victory on the plain of Sarāī Karūnda or Garūnda" (*A. N.* II. 33; tr. II. 54). B. calls it 'Gharamanda where there is now a famous *Sarāī*' (II. 15, *l.* 9; tr. II. 8). Mr. Beveridge seeks to identify it with the 'Kharkhauda' of the *Āīn.* (Jarrett's tr. II. 104, 287). But this suggestion is absolutely untenable, 'Kharkhauda' is in Rohtak and about forty miles *south* of Pānīpat, to which Akbar was marching from Jālandhar by way of Karnāl. 'Garaunda' and 'Kharkhauda' are two distinct places and both are separately marked in Constable's Atlas, Plate 25 B c. Kharkhanda is about fifty miles south of Gharaunda. They are clearly distinguished in the Gazetteer of Thornton also, who places 'Ghuraunda' or 'Gurounda' in Lat. 29°-32' N. and Long. 77°- 2' E. and 'Khurkhouda' in Lat. 28°-52' N. Long. 76°-58' E. Both are now railway stations also, but 'Gharaunda' is on the Kālkā branch of the North Western Railway, 'Kharkhanda' on the Khurja section of the East Indian Railway.

V. 252, *l.* 16. *On the morning of Friday, [2nd] Muharram, 964 H. (5 November, 1556) .... the generals marshalled their forces to receive the attack.*

2nd Muḥarram, [according to the Book-rule], was Thursday, 5th November. If the weekday was Friday, the battle must have been fought on 2nd Muḥarram, according to the *Rūyyat* or *Hilālī* reckoning, and 6th November 1556. But Abū-l-Faẓl gives the date as *Thursday*, 2nd Muḥarram 964 H.—23rd Ābān Ilāhī (*A. N.* II. 37; tr. II. 60). Budāūnī makes it "Friday, 10 Muḥarram, which day is also called *Roz-i-'Āshūra*" (M. T. II. 15; tr. II. 8), but he must have misread دوم as دهم. The Ilāhī correspondence works out correctly with 2nd Muḥarram,

V. 254, *l.* 2. *He captured all the persons and took possession of all the treasures and valuables and conducted them to the foot of the throne.*

جميع آن مردم را بدست آورده غنائم نفيس جهت سركار خاصه
ضبط نموده بشرف خاكبوس سرافراز آمد

B. I. text II. 133, *l.* 3; Lith. 246, *l.* 1.

"He [Pīr Muḥammad Shīrwānī] took all those persons captive and took possession of the valuable booty on behalf of the Royal Exchequer. He was then exalted by being permitted to make his obeisance to the emperor."

The persons "conducted to the foot of the throne" were not the persons captured, but their captor and plunderer, Pīr Muḥammad. Cf. *A. N.* II. 46; tr. II. 72, where it is said of this ruffian that he "answered Hemū's eighty-year-old father only with the tongue of the sword, and came away with much plunder and fifty elephants and did homage at court and was the recipient of many royal favours."

V. 262, *l.* 3 from foot. *Now you must make yourself quite at ease about them, so that you may continue to serve me with a tranquil mind.*

اولى [و] انسب [كه] ايشانرا از جانب خود تسلى كنيد تا بخواطر جمع در
لوازم خدمتگاري قيام توانند نمود

Lith. 250, *l.* 2 from foot. B. I. text II. 144, *l.* 8.

"The best and most proper thing would be that you should reassure them from your own side [*i. e.* tell them that *they* have given you no offence and they have nothing to fear from you], so that *they* may be able to perform their duties here with tranquil hearts." Cf. Lowe, Budāūnī, tr. II. 30. The persons who were to be "made quite at ease" were the personal attendants of Akbar, not Bairam Khān.

V. 270 last line. *Rūpmatī, his favourite wife, who used to recite poetry, several other wives, and all his treasure fell into the hands of the imperial forces.*

روپ متى نام حرم دوستدار او كه بنام او شعر ميگفت

B. I. text II. 152, *l.* 13; Lith. 254, *l.* 3 from foot.

Elsewhere in the Mālwa section, Niẓāmu-d-dīn expresses himself thus:

باز بهادر را زني بود روپ متي نام كه عاشق و فريفتهٔ او بود و اشعاري
كه بزبان هندي ميگفت روپ متي داخل ميكرد

596, *l.* 11 from foot.

This seems to mean that Bāz Bahādur inserted *her name in his poems* or songs. Abū-l-Faẓl declares explicitly that it was Bāz Bahādur, who "used to pour out his heart in Hindī poems descriptive of his love" (*A. N.* II. 137; tr. II. 217). The *Makhzan-i-Afghānī* states that "Rūpmatī had so captivated him that every moment not spent with her was painful to him; he composed Indian love-songs and assumed to himself a poetical name" (Dorn, History of the Afghans I. 175).

Rūpmatī's own poems are said to be still sung in Mālwa and twenty-six compositions attributed to her have been recently translated into English by Mr. L. C. Crump under the cryptic and somewhat fanciful title of the 'Lady of the Lotus'. The reason given for the choice is that, according to popular legend, she was that rare creature of Hindū romance, a *Padminī*. These verses are in the form of *Dohas*, *Kavittas* and *Sawāīs*, but the authenticity of some of them, at least, is as doubtful, as the facts or rather, the legends, connected with her life. She is said, by some, to have been the daughter of a Rāṭhor Rājpūt named Thānsiṁha, who was the lord of Dharmapurī; by others, of a resident or brāhmaṇ of Sārangpūr. She is also stated to have been a *pātrā*, i. e. courtesan or dancing girl (Crump, *op. cit.* 8, 27–29). The tragic circumstances of her demise have cast the glamour of romance round the place of her burial and this also is uncertain. Blochmann's statement that she and Bāz Bahādur are buried side by side in a tank at Ujjain (*Āīn*, tr. I. 429 note) is an echo of one popular tradition or belief, which Mr. Beveridge discredits (*A. N.* tr. II. 214 note). Mr. Crump is of opinion that they have found a common resting place in a cenotaph at Sārangpūr (*Loc. cit.* 30). But the contemporaneous *Makhzan-i-Afghānī* seems to flatly contradict both these popular beliefs or suppositions and asserts that Bāz Bahādur was "interred at Āgra near the Alem Gunj" (Dorn, I. 179). As regards the poems, Mr. Crump admits that "doubts will be felt, and rightly, over some of the pieces and that some of them appear to be the productions of later bards" (p. 32).

As the phrase بنام او شعر میگفت is amphibological, I may cite another passage in which the meaning is free from doubt. In speaking of Rāisiṁha, the Rājā of Halwad in Jhālāwār, Niẓāmu-d-dīn writes thus :

مردم بلاد گجرات شعرها و قصرها بنام او [رای سنگ] نبشته
اند و شهرت عظیم دارد

T. A. B. I. text II. 396, *l.* 12; Lith. 363, *l.* 6; E. D. V. 443.

"The people of Gujarāt have written many poems and romances in his honour (lit. name) and he is greatly renowned there". So when we are told of Rūpmatī that Bāz Bahādur "wrote poems in her honour" what the author really means is that he celebrated his love for her and her beauty in his songs and verses. The poetry was not "recited" by Rupmatī, but by Bāz Bahādur. None of the three historians countenances Rūpmati's claim to be a poetess.

V. 274, *l.* 2. *And his [Bhārā Mal's] daughter an honourable lady, was accepted by His Majesty, and took her place among the ladies of the Court.*

But the text reads thus:

و دختر او کہ مخدرۂ عصمت بود باز دواج آنحضرت امتیاز یافتہ در سلک از دواج محترم منتظم گردید

Lith. 256, *l.* 9; B. I. text II, 155, *l.* 15.

"And his daughter, who was a chaste lady behind the curtain was exalted by being married to His Majesty and was enrolled among the honoured consorts [of the emperor]." The word between سلک and محترم should be read as ازواج, the plural of زوج 'wife' and not as ازدواج. Dowson's rendering 'ladies of the court' is utterly inadequate.

V. 277, *l.* 15. *This murder [of Shamsu-d-dīn Muḥammad Khān Ātka] was committed on the morning of Sunday, 12th Ramaẓān 970 H.*

The weekday is given as Monday دو شنبہ in the Lith. (257, *l.* 7 from foot) as well as the B. I. text (II. 158, *l.* 4 from foot). B. has Monday, 12th Ramaẓān 969 H. (I. 52, *l.* 15; tr. Lowe, II. 49). But Abū-l-Faẓl's date is Saturday, 12th Ramaẓān 969 H. or 5th Khurdād of the 7th year (*A. N.* II. 174; tr. II. 269). This was equivalent to Saturday, 16th May, 1562 and may be, therefore, presumed to be correct.

12th Ramaẓān 970 H. was neither Sunday, nor Monday, but Wednesday, 5th May 1563. Niẓāmu-d-dīn's chronology is not unfrequently erratic and inconsistent. He has put the event wrongly into the 8th year, instead of into the 7th.

1st Muḥarram 969 Hijra was Thursday 11th September 1561.

1st Muḥarram 970 Hijra was Monday 31st August 1562.

V. 278, *l.* 4. *The thought of having participated in this plot weighed upon the mind of Mun'im Khān.*

چون واهمۂ ایقاع فتنۂ مذکور برخاطر منعم خان مرکوز گشتہ بود

Lith. 258, *l.* 1; B. I. 159, *l.* 9.

"And as the fear of (being suspected of) having originated (instigated or abetted) the said violent crime had become firmly fixed in the mind of Mun'im Khān (he fled)."

Abū-l-Faẓl (A. N. II. 174; tr. II. 269) and Budāūnī (II. 52, 54; tr. II. 49, 51) roundly accuse Mun'im Khān of having been envious of the Ātgah and instigated his murder. The T̤. A. accuses him and Shihābu-d-dīn Aḥmad Khān of having caused (اغوای) the assassination. Mun'im Khān had been appointed *Wakīl-i-Muṭlaq* after the fall of Bairam, but when the Ātgah returned from the Punjab, he regained his influence and again became *Wakīl-i-Muṭlaq* (T̤. A. B. I. text II. 148, *l.* 14; 155, *l.* 7; 158, *l.* 15).

V. 278, *l.* 21. *Other tribes such as the Khari, Jānūba, Jatrīya, Bhūkīyal and Jāt dwell in these parts in subordination to the Gakhars.*

The B. I. text II. 160, *l.* 1 reads the names as

کہتری و جانوهیه و جریهم و بهوکیال و جت و ماریہ و منکرال

Cf. also Lith. 258, *l.* 8.

The correct designations appear to be "Khattar, Jānūhas, Johiya, Būgiyāl, Jāt, Māriya and Mangarāl. The first name has been supposed by some writers to stand for Khatrī, but the people really meant are the 'Khatars', who are found in the western part of Rāwalpindī district and elsewhere. The Jānjuhas, Johīyas [Jūdh] and Bugyāls are mentioned as occupants of the Salt Range in the *Bāburnāma* (tr. 379–380, 452; E. D. IV. 232, 240).

The fifth name may be *Jāt*, but it is more probably, an error for *Chībh* (چبھ) as there are few or no Jāts in the Salt Range. The Chībhs, as well as the Mangarāl or Mangarwāls, are settled in Jammū and the neighbourhood. 'Mārīya' cannot be identified.

A good commentary on this passage is provided in the list of tribes and castes occupying the Sind Sāgar Dūāb, which is found in the *Āīn*. (tr. II. 322–5). They are, "Gakkar, Khatar, Awān, Jānūhah, Bagīyāl, Afghān Niyāzī, etc." Abū-l-Faẓl speaks of a tribe called 'Mangharwāl' also, as settled in a *pargana* called Būhatī and another named Malot in the Chenhat Dūāb (*ibid.* 322). See also Blochmann's note in *Āīn*. tr. I (second edition), p. 507 and *Maāṣiru-l-Umarā*, III, 144, *l.* 10.

Būgyāls, Khatars and Dilāzāks are mentioned, by Jahāngīr also, as inhabitants of the Salt Range, when he passed through the district in the second year of his reign (*Tūzuk*, tr. I. 97, 100; E. D. VI. 309, 312).

V. 280, *l.* 2 from foot. *Tūlak Khān Kūlchīn.*

قوابچين in the B. I. text II. 162, *l.* 13 also, but the *A. N.* II. 184, tr. II. 285 and Budāūnī (II. 56; tr. 56, 153, 157) have Qūchīn, which is undoubtedly correct. See my note on E. D. III. 404, *l.* 18 in S. I. M. H. Vol. I, 349.

V. 286, *l.* 9 from foot. *Mirzā Muhammad Hakīm also sent a person to Mirzā Sulaimān.*

The lithograph has تیرکش (262, *l.* 2), but the B. I. text agrees with Dowson's MS in reading the sentence thus :

II. 169, *l.* 3. میرزا محمد حکیم نیز کس خود نزد میرزا سلیمان فرستاده

And this is most probably, right, as such expressions as کسان خود فرستاده or کس are very frequently used in the Ṭ. A. (II. 188, *l.* 16; 191, *l.* 6; 198 last line; 199, *l.* 6).

V. 287, *l.* 4 from foot. *Conquest of the fort of Chunār.*

Niẓāmu-d-dīn records this event in the chronicle of the ninth year, i. e. 971–2 H. Abū-l-Faẓl puts it into the sixth (968–9 H.) and Budāūnī into the seventh or 969–970 H. (II. 63; tr. 62). As the stronghold is said to have been surrendered to Shaikh Muḥammad Ghauṣ and Āṣaf Khān, and the Shaikh is stated by several writers to have died on 14th Muḥarram 970 H. [Beale, *Miftāḥ*, 173, *l.* 5, Budāūnī, text II. 63; tr. II. 62; Blochmann *Āīn.* tr. I (reprint), p. 509; M. U. II. 578, *l.* 10], Niẓāmu-d-dīn *must* be wrong and the correct year must be 969 H.

V. 289, *l.* 13. *He [Akbar] marched on towards Mālwa and halted at Rewār.*

The Cawnpore lithograph drops out some words here and the name of the town also is missing, but the B. I. text has زتود (172, *l.* 2). This name may be restored, by the transfer of a dot from the bottom to the top of the second letter, to رنود. 'Ranod' is situated about fifty miles north-east of Goona, Lat. 25°-0′ N., Long. 77°-53′ E. (Thornton). The place where Akbar halted is called 'Ranad' رند by Abū-l-Faẓl also (*A. N.* II. 224; tr. II. 344). The name is spelt 'Rannaud' in the Official Guide to Indian Post Offices. But it is also known as 'Narod' and is shown under that name in the I. G. Atlas, Pl. 38 B. 2. See also Cunningham, who mentions the two names borne by this town and says that "*Ran* is a well-known interchange of pronunciation with Nar" (A. G. I. Ed. 1871, p. 193).

V. 290, *l*. 14. *The imperial army then moved, and on the new moon of Zī-l-hijja 791 H. reached Māndū.*

It is سلخ ذی الحجہ and means the *last day* (29th or 30th) of Ẓī-l-ḥijja, not the 1st. The year should be 971 H., not 791 H. [B. I. text II. 173, *l*. 13).

V. 291, last line. *The emperor Humāyūn ...... had felt constrained to speak about and censure his [Khwāja Mu'aẓẓam's] offences to his son and successor.*

آن حضرت بواسطهٔ رعایت خاطر شاهزادهٔ عالیمقدار از تقصیرات او
اغماز فرموده در میگذشتند B. I. text 175, *l*. 10.

"His Majesty [Humāyūn], from a regard for the feelings of the prince of exalted dignity [*Scil.* Akbar, who was the son of Mu'aẓẓam's sister] had overlooked his offences and forgiven them." In 953 H. when Humāyūn was in Badakhshān, Khwāja Mu'aẓẓam had murdered a Shi'ā, named Khwāja Rashīdī and then fled to Kābul and been thrown into prison (Ṭ. A. B. I. text II. 66, *l*. 11; E. D. V. 224; *A. N*. I. 254; tr. I. 495). Abū-l-Faẓl says that Humāyūn had consideration for the noble lady (his sister) and used to pass by his offences (*A. N*. II. 217; tr. II. 334).

V. 294, *l*. 10 from foot. *The emperor himself started for Narwar and Garha by way of Dhūlpūr.*

گرهہ 'Garha' in the B. I. text II. 178, *l*. 5 from foot, but گرهہ in the lith. 265, *l*. 12. There is a 'Garha', about ten miles east of Ranod or Narod, about forty south-east of Siprī and about sixty south-east of Narwar (I. G. Atlas, Pl. 38 C. 2). But the place meant appears from the context to have been much nearer Narwar and it must be the 'Karera' of *ibid*. 38 C. 2, which lies about eighteen miles south-east of Narwar. Abū-l-Faẓl always speaks of it as 'Karhara' (*A. N*. II. 244, 246; tr. II. 368, 371).

V. 294 last line. *They drove them [the elephants] towards the fort of Pānwa.*

The Bibl. Ind. text reads the name as پنانو (II. 179, *l*. 2) and the *A. N.* as بیانو Bapānwa (II. 245: tr. II. 371). The *Āīn*. registers 'Bayānwān' as a *sarkār* and town in the Ṣūba of Āgra (*Āīn*. tr. Jarrett, II. 188) and it is also stated that wild elephants were found and caught in the jungles of Bayānwān and Narwar (*Āīn*. tr. Blochmann, I. 122 and 618). The emperor Bābur also speaks of having assigned to Tātār

Khān Sārang Khānī a subsistence-allowance of twenty *lākhs* in the *pargana* of Biānwān" (*B. N.* tr. 540; Erskine, Memoirs, 346). Perhaps, the place meant is 'Pawāin', a village on the Sind river about sixteen miles north-east of Datīa. It is now in Gwālior state territory. But there is still another reading, which is favoured by the Cawnpore lithograph of the T. A. (265, *l.* 11). It is ساٽوه 'Sānwa' or 'Sānūh'.

V. 306, *l.* 18. *He [Khān Zamān] crossed the river and went to Muhammadābād, one of the dependencies of Jaunpūr.*

But the original has ازاعمال موده (Lith. 271, *l.* 11 from foot). The B. I. text II. 192, *l.* 7 has مونه. Both forms must be errors for موره Mūūh or Maūh. Budāūnī speaks of it as a dependency of Maū (II. 83; tr. II. 84). This Maū, called Maū-Nāthbhanjan, to distinguish it from other places of the same name, is now in A'zamgarh and lies about 14 miles south of Muḥammadābād (*A. N.* tr. II. 396 note). See also my note in S. I. M. H. Vol. I, 527. Maū and Muḥammadābād are both marked in Constable's Atlas Pl. 28 C. c.

V. 308, *l.* 17. *Khwāja Jahān, Mīr Murtazā Sharīfī and Makhdūmu-l-Mulk were commanded to go to Khān Zamān, to reprove him .... Then, as required, he [Khān Zamān] expressed contrition for his faults.*

The words in the original are نزد خان زمان رفتہ او را توبہ دادہ
B. I. text II. 194, *l.* 4 from foot; Lith. 272, *l.* 7 from foot.

"They were to go to him and give him توبہ *i. e.* make him say in their presence words purporting 'I have repented', or 'I confess that I have sinned.' He is said to have received them with honour and respect and the penitent rebel is afterwards stated to have

توبہ و سوگند بنوعی کہ حکم کردہ بود یاد کردہ

ibid, last line and *l.* 5 from foot.

"repeated [the formula of] repentance and took an oath [not to transgress again], in the manner prescribed [by the emperor]." Dowson himself states that he "expressed *contrition* for his faults" and that he and his confederates "*repented* of their unrighteous deeds."

از افعال ناشایستہ خود توبہ نمودہ

T. A. II. 195, *l.* 2; Cf. also A. N. II. 268; tr. II. 398.

Abū-l-Faẓl says that when Kāmrān begged permission to go on pilgrimage in 955 H. Humāyūn sent a religious devotee named Mīr

'Arab of Makka to give him توبه, as he had been making professions of penitence. The Mīr did not mince matters and "at every sentence of reproof, the Mirzā × × × held down the head of submission, and cried, 'I have sinned, I have sinned'" (*A. N.* I. 279; tr. I. 532–3). Mr. Erskine says that he repeatedly "made the humblest confession of his past 'errors' and gave promises of a change of conduct', (H. B. H. II. 343, 356). When Mirzā Muḥammad Ḥakīm's rebellion petered out in a few days and he was brought to his knees, Akbar agreed to forget and forgive only on the condition that he repented of the past and bound himself by oath for the future".

اگر میرزا از اعمال گذشته نادم باشد که توبه نماید و سوگند بخورد

Ṭ. A. Lith. 350, *l.* 5 from foot; E. D. V. 424.

V. 311, *l.* 5. *She [Khurram Begam] sent forward some persons to assure Mirzā Muhammad Hakīm of her great affection for him, that having no son of her own, she looked upon him as her son.*

The words put into her mouth are

شما را بجای فرزند میدانم بتخصیص درین وقت که نسبت فرزندی بنسبت وصلت موکد و مستحکم گشته است

Lith. 274, *l.* 8 from foot.

"I look upon you as a son, especially now that the relationship of a son has been made stronger and more permanent by that of your union [with my daughter]."

Abū-l-Faẓl says: "She gave him the message that he always was dearer to her than a son of her own body, especially since there had been an additional alliance"—the marriage with her daughter (*A. N.* II. 273; tr. II. 407).

V. 314, *l.* 1. *After crossing the Jumna, he received intelligence of the flight of Mirzā Muhammad Hakīm.*

The name of the river is given as *Sutlej* in the Lith. 276, *l.* 11 from foot and the B. I. text II. 202, *l.* 6 from foot. This *must be* right, as the emperor is stated to have reached Sirhind, before the arrival of the information. It is 'Sutlej' also in the corresponding passage of the *Akbarnāma* (text II. 277; tr. II. 411).

V. 318, *l.* 10 from foot. *The Jogīs who wear only rags, were over five hundred ......; some soldiers [of the emperor's] smeared their persons with ashes and went to support the Sannyāsīs who were the weaker party.*

They must have done so because the Sannyāsīs wore practically no clothes and belonged to the class known as *Nāgās* or 'Naked'. "These bodies of so-called Hindu devotees," writes Mr. Irvine, "were common in the armies of the 18th century. × × × Anquetil Duperron (Zend Avesta I. LXXV) describes a body of these armed vagabonds, numbering some 6000 men, that he met in 1757, on their way to Jagannāth. × × × Hājī Mustafā, came across five thousand of these devotees on their way to the Ganges at Sāgar; they were all of them tall, stout, well-limbed men, in general *stark* naked, but very well-armed" (Dalrymple's Oriental Repertory, II. 239). A description of a corps of these *Nāgās*, commanded by a disciple (*chela*) of Himmat Bahādur, × × will be found in Broughton, Letters, 96, 104, 106, 123; Blacker, War, 22 says "the Gossyes" i. e. Gusāins or Nāgās, "have always been considered good troops" (Army of the Indian Mughals, 163). Elsewhere, we read that "these Nāga Sanyāsīs were, in the latter half of the 18th century, really a body of banditti and their record is a very sinister one. They used to issue periodically from their haunts in the jungles, in large bodies, plundering and levying exactions far and wide. They were bold enough to plunder the city of Dacca about 1764 and the geographer, James Rennell, was nearly cut to pieces in an encounter with them in Kooch Behār. In 1767, they entered *sarkar* Sarong in Behār and killed and wounded about 80 of the E. I. Company's sepoys. In 1773, Warren Hastings complains of their annually infesting the province of Bengal about February, on the pretence of pilgrimage to Jagannāth and marching in bodies of 1000 and sometimes even 10000 men,' (Yule and Burnell, Hobson Jobson, *s. v.* Sunyāsee). The word *Jogī* is very loosely used for several orders of ascetics and the Ṭ. A. has obscured the matter by speaking of the event as a fight between Jogīs and Sannyāsīs. Abū-l-Faẓl states more accurately that the "quarrel was between *two parties* of *Sannyāsīs*; one was called Kur (or Gur) and the other Purī. He also gives the names of the respective leaders as Ānand Gur (Girī) and Kisū Pūrī, which proves that they belonged to rival sections of *Dasnāmī* Sannyāsīs (*A. N.* II. 286–7; tr. II 423–4). Ānand Gīr, was, like Himmat Gir Gosāin, a Nāgā.

These "great assemblages" of pilgrims take place at Thānesar, Niẓāmu-d-dīn states, on the days of eclipses. There was an eclipse of the Sun on 9th April 1567 = 15th Vadī, Chaitra, 1623 = 29th Ramaẓān 974 H. (Cunningham, Indian Eras. 219; Indian Ephemeris, V. p. 336).

Akbar left Lāhore on the 12th of Ramaẓān (A. N. II. 226; tr. 442) and must have arrived just when Thānesar was thronged by devotees and mendicants for the bathing festival on the eclipse of the 29th of that month. There is an account of the vagrant and violent habits" of the Nāgā Sannyāsīs in H. H. Wilson's Hindu Religious Sects (Select Works, I. 238–240. See also Asiatic Researches, II. 455).

V. 321, *l.* 11 from foot. *This battle [of Mankarwāl] was fought .... on Monday, the 1st of Zī-l-hijja 974 H.*

Abū-l-Faẓl has the same date and weekday (*A. N.* II. 292; tr. II. 430). It was Monday, 9th June 1567 A. D.

V. 323, *l.* 20. *This greatly discouraged the Uzbeks and they sent men to 'Alī Kulī and Muzaffar Khān to treat for peace.*

Read 'Muḥammad *Qulī* (Birlās)', as in the B. I. text II. 213, *l.* 13. The Lith. has 'Muḥammad 'Alī Khān' (281, *l.* 6 from foot), but this also must be wrong. قلي is very likely to be miswritten as علی. The word is correctly spelt قلي when he is again mentioned on the very next page (Lith. 282, *l.* 7).

V. 331, *l.* 17. *The Jāgīr of Muhammad Khān-i-Kalān became a tankhwāh.*

و جاگیر میر محمد خان کلان در سرکار سنبل تنخواه شد

Lith 286, *l.* 4 from foot; B. I. text II. 222, *l.* 8.

And a *jāgīr* in the district of Sambal was assigned to Mīr Muḥammad, Khān-i-Kalān [in lieu of the *jāgīr* which he had held in the Punjāb, when he was the governor of that province].

The fourteenth year of the reign began, not on 5th Ramaẓān 976 H. as is stated on *l.* 2 from foot, but on 22nd Ramaẓān 976 (A. N. II. 336; tr. II. 439).

V. 331 foot note 2. *The fort was held by Rustam Khān, a Turkī slave, in whose house the sister of Changīz Khān had taken refuge (Akbarnāma II. 418).*

As this phrase در خانهٔ او بود has been misunderstood even by Mr. Beveridge, I may be allowed to refer to a passage in Khwāfī Khān, in which he states that عمهٔ فتح جنگ درخانهٔ او [رعایت خان] بود

II. 959, *l.* 5.

"The aunt of Fatḥ Jang was the wife of Ra'āit Khān." The *Maaṣiru-l-Umarā* declares in the biography of Naqīb Khān that the sister of Yūsuf Khān Raẓvī was married to him.

III. 817, *l*. 1. و همشیرهٔ مرزا یوسف خان رضوی در خانهٔ او بود
Elsewhere (*ibid*. 561, *l*. 11) the same author writes that
کوکم زاده دارا شکوه در خانهٔ محمد صالح بود

See also *ibid*. II. 629, *l*. 18; 832, *l*. 4.

Jahāngīr states that Jānish Begam, the sister of Shāh Ṭahmāsp was in the house of (married to) Mīr Ni'matullāh" (*T. J.* tr. I. 111). The phrase in the text is درخانهٔ میر × × بود (62, *l*. 6 from foot).

Mir Ma'ṣūm also uses the phrase
همشیرهٔ او درخانهٔ سلطان محمود بود

"His sister was in the house of Sulṭān Maḥmūd Khān (of Bhakkar)" (*Tārīkh-i-Sind*, 235, *l*. 4).

V. 332, *l* 2 from foot. *Shaikh Salīm Chishtī .... had gladdened him [Akbar] with the promise of a son.*

The word is فرزندان in the plural (Lith. 287, *l*. 11 from foot; B. I. text II, 225, *l*. 10).

The emperor Jahāngīr states that the Shaikh had predicted the birth of *three* پسر or sons (*Tūzuk*. text 1, *l*. 18; R and B's tr. I. 2).

V. 334, *l*. 2. *On Wednesday, 18th of Rabī'u-l-awwal 977 H., prince Salīm was born.*

The date is given as 17th in the lith. 288, *l*. 4, as well as in the B. I. text (II. 226, *l*. 7 from foot), and by Budāūnī (II. 120; tr. II. 124). Jahāngīr himself informs us in his Memoirs that he was born seven *gharīs* after sunrise on Wednesday, the 17th of Rabī' I. 977 H. (*Tūzuk-i-Jahāngīrī*. text 1, *l*. 11; tr. I. p. 2). Mr. Beveridge (*A. N.* trans. II. 504 note) and Mr. Vincent Smith (Akbar, 102, 452) give the Julian equivalent as 30th August 1569, while Von Noer (The Emperor Akbar, tr. II. 247) makes it the 29th of August; but both these correspondences are wrong and the correct one is the 31st. If the week-day was Wednesday, as every one admits, the book-rule date must have been the 18th. Abū-l-Faẓl does not give the Hijra date at all. He states that the birth took place seven hours after sun-rise on 18th Shahrīvar Ilāhī and 11th Bahman of the 938 Yazdajardī year (*A. N*. II. 344; tr. II. 503–4).

Now 18th Shahrīvar is the 174th day of the Ilāhī calendar and the 243rd (174 + 69) of the Roman, *i. e.* 31st August.

So also 11th Bahman is the 311th day of the Yazdajardī calendar. The initial day of 938 A. Y. was 25th October, 1568 (Cowasji Patell's

Chronology). 25th October is the 298th day of the Roman calendar (298 + 311 = 609 − 366 = 243, *i. e.*, 31st August 1569). The correct Hijrā date must be therefore 18th by the book-rule, but 17th by *Rūyyat*. It may be as well to state that 1st Muḥarram 977 H. was Thursday, 16th June 1569 A. C. according to the tables.

V. 338, *l*. 6. ***This Sultān Mahmūd Salāī Samarkandī told Nāhid Begam that if Muhibb 'Alī Khān would undertake the conquest of Thatta, he would join and assist him.***

The B. I. text reads the sentence thus :

سلطان محمود صلاي سمرقنديانم زده گفت

II. 233, *l*. 10 from foot.

The lith. has صلاي سمرقند بارزنان گفت 291, *l*. 10.

صلا means 'invitation, proclamation', and صلاي سمرقنديانم زدن probably signifies "talking tall, insincerely or glibly, giving large or liberal promises like the people of Samarqand". Khwāfī Khān uses a similar phrase in his account of the rebellion of prince Khusrav.

وحسن بيگ بدخشي كه خميراين جماعه از بيوفائي سرشته اند × × ×
باخسرو درخورده بمحض تكليف سمرقندي باسي صدسوار رفاقت نمود

B. I. text I. 250.

"And Ḥasan Beg the Badakhshī, who belonged to a race in which disloyalty is implanted by nature, on forgathering with Khusrav, joined him with three hundred horsemen, on receiving *only a Samarqandian invitation.*"

The meaning seems to be that though he was pressed only half-heartedly or only for form's sake, he snapped the offer. Samarqand was probably notorious for the insincerity of its residents. Compare the English words 'Bunkum' and 'Blarney', which are also derived from the names of places.

The M. U. paraphrases the expression and states that

سلطان محمود والي بهكر آنجا سخنان يک جهتي درميان آورد

III. 240, last line.

That is, "Sulṭān Maḥmūd of Bhakkar uttered words signifying complete agreement with her there". The Ṭ. A. states that he afterwards looked upon the words he had uttered and the promises he had given as fairy tales.

سخنانيكه ... گفتم و وعدها داده بود افسانه انگاشتم

B. I. text II. 234, *l*. 5.

V. 339, *l.* 10 from foot. *Each [Mun'im Khān and Sikandar Uzbeg] received a jewelled sword, belt and four horses with golden saddles.*

و بهر کدام کمر شمشیر مرصع و چارقب و اسپ بازین
طلابخشیده سرافراز ساختند

Lith. 292, *l.* 7; B. I. text II. 235, *l.* 11.

"And he exalted each of them by bestowing a jewelled sword, belt, a *Chihārqab* and a horse with a gold-embroidered saddle." The *Chihārqab* or *Chārqab* is defined in the *Bihār-i-A'ẓam* of Munshī Tekchand as a garment (پوشش), the wearing of which was the peculiar privilege or prerogative [مخصوص] of the Sulṭāns of Tūrān. Mr. Lowe says it was a vest or sleeveless dress of honour (B. tr. II. 222, 391).

Niẓāmu-d-dīn records two other instances of the gift of a *Chārqab*. This honour was bestowed upon Ḥusain Qulī Khān (or Khān-i-Jahān), when he was made governor of Bengal and *Amīru-l-Umarā* after the death of Mun'im Khān (Ṭ. A. Lith. 331, *l.* 13; B. I. text 318, *l.* 9). And when Prince Murād was sent to Mālwā, he also received among other rarely-bestowed honours a

چهارقب شاهی کہ مخصوص شاهزادها ست

'a royal *Chihārqab*' which is reserved for princes (*ibid.* 374, *l.* 4 from foot; B. I. 413, *l.* 6). Jonathan Scott says in a note to his translation of Irādat Khān's Memoirs that it is "an upper robe, never conferred but on princes of the royal family, the Vizier of the empire and Ameer al Amra" (Firishta's History of the Dekkan, Edit. 1794, Vol. II. Pt. IV, p. 28 note).

V. 344, *l.* 4 from foot. *When they heard this, the emperor's followers endeavoured to conceal themselves.*

Dowson has unwittingly cast a slur upon Akbar's paladins, if not cruelly defamed them.

مقربان بارگاه از استماع این خبر شروع در جبه پوشیدن کردند

B. I. text II. 242, *l.* 4.

"The attendants at the Court on hearing this news began to put on (or invest themselves with) their armour or coats of mail."

The lithograph makes nonsense of the passage. It has در صهبانوشیدن کردند (295, *l.* 15), which cannot be made to yield any meaning. Budāūnī has got it quite right; for he uses the words :

شروع دریوشیدن سلاح نمودند (II. 142; tr. 146). Abū-l-Faẓl says Akbar ordered them "to put on their cuirasses" (A. N. III. 13; tr. III. 19).

V. 347, *l.* 13. *The thickness of the double walls is five yards and the height twenty yards.*

دیوار دوتهی (B. I. text II. 245, *l.* 14) does not mean 'double walls', but the walls of the *dūtahī*, otherwise called *ābduzd* آب دزد "a covered way or double-walled road which runs down to the river, lake or tank from which the garrison receives its supply of water." There was such a *dūtahī* in the fort of Chanderī also (*B. N.* 595 and 109; E. D. IV. 276).

The word rendered 'yard' is ذرع, which is generally used for the cubit of about eighteen inches. The walls of this 'water-stealing' passage were made so thick and high because it was liable to be bombarded by a besieging enemy from the river.

V. 348, *l.* 18. *But some of the Begam's servants fell into his [Shāh Qulī Khān's] hands.*

پارهٔ احمال و اثقال مردم بیگم بدست نوکران او افتاد

Lith. 297, *l.* 7 from foot; B. I. text 246, *l.* 14. *i. e.* "the heavy baggage of the Begam's people fell into the hands of his servants."

Budāūnī says the pursuers "came back with part of the baggage and effects, which they had succeeded in capturing" (II. 144; tr. II. 148).

V. 348, *l.* 12 from foot. *His Majesty .... encamped at the distance of a kos from Sūrat on the 18th of Ramazān.*

The lithograph has 17th and so also the B. I. text 246, *l.* 5 from foot; but the date must be wrong, as the castle is said, by Niẓāmu-d-dīn himself to have been taken after a siege of "nearly two months" on the 23rd Shawwāl 980 H.

As Abū-l-Faẓl gives the exact duration of the siege as "one month and seventeen days" (*A. N.* III. 28; tr. III. 39), the correct Hijra date must have been *seventh*, (هفتم) not (هفدهم), 'seventeenth' of Ramaẓān.

V. 349, *l.* 9. *Every hole big enough for a mouse was closed.*

وهم درسوراخ همچون موش رفتن ملتمس گشتند

B. I. text II. 247, *l.* 15.

"And all [the men in the fortress] hid themselves in holes like mice and were besieged."

The clause is not found in the lithograph. All that B. says is that "not an individual of the garrison dared to show his head" (II. 144, *l.* 4 from foot; tr. II. 148).

V. 351, *l.* 6. *The Rājā of Bāglāna captured and sent to His Majesty's presence Sharafu-d-dīn Husain Mirzā, who, for ten years past had been engaged in various turbulent and rebellious proceedings.*

کہ قبل ازین بدہ سال بواسطۂ حرکات ناخوش و امور نالائق کہ در ضمن حکایات سابق شمۂ از آن تحریر یافتہ طریق بغي و عناد پیمودہ غبار فتنہ و فساد برانگیختہ بود

B. I. text II. 249, *l.* 3 from foot; Lith. 299, *l.* 6.

"Who *had, ten years befere this date*, been guilty of reprehensible behaviour and unworthy proceedings (of which some have been described in the earlier part of this narrative), and had trodden the path of mutiny and rebellion and raised the smoke of turmoil and disturbance."

He had not been continuously engaged in rebellious proceedings for ten years past. He had rebelled about *ten years before*, in 1562 A. D. Abū-l-Fażl relates his adventures and says that "he had become a vagabond and wandered from door to door of every one, high or low, and given his honour to the dust of disgrace" (*A. N.* III. 29–30; tr. III. 42). Budāūnī says that he had been "a *wanderer for ten years* and had at last fallen into the hands of Bahārjīv" (II. 147, *l.* 5; tr. II. 151). He had first fled to Chingīz Khān of Gujarāt, then to the Mīrān Mubārak of Khāndesh and then to Muḥammad Ḥusain Mirzā (M. U. II. 109, 112; Blochmann, *Āīn.* tr. I. reprint 340).

V. 354, *l.* 16. *They came up with the Mirzā one evening at the village of Katholī, twenty kos from Nāgor.*

I am indebted to a local authority for the information that there is a village called Khatolaī, about thirty-five miles south-east of Nāgaur (or Nāgor).

V. 358, *l.* 5 from foot. *Husain Qulī Khān held a secret council with the amīrs about the course necessary to be pursued.*

But the text reads thus

حسین قلی خان متفکر گشتہ مضمون خطوط را بمقتضای مصلحت وقت از جمیع امرا مخفی میداشت

Lith. 303, *l.* 21; B. I. text II. 259, *l.* 8.

"Ḥusain Qulī Khān was greatly perturbed and thought it best, under the exigencies of the occasion, to keep the purport of the letters concealed from the *Amīrs*."

He was afraid that the other commanders would advise him to abandon the siege, which he himself was determined to prosecute to a successful conclusion. He was anxious to avoid a stalemate, now that he was within an ace of taking the fortress by capitulation. If he was forced to withdraw or abandon the seige by colleagues in a state of panic it would neutralise all his previous successes.

V. 361 last line. *To expedite matters, he, on the same day sent the men of his advanced guard out of the city to join his camp equipage.*

و از امرا مهم سازی هرکه صورت میافت در همان روز سزاولان اورا
از شهر بیرون برده بپیش خانه عالی میرسانیدند

Lith. 305, *l.* 6 from foot; B. I. text 263, *l.* 5 from foot.

"And every one of the *amīrs* who had orders to join the expedition was, on the very day on which it was possible for him, conducted by *sazāwals* (orderlies or *aides de camp*) out of the city and made to join the emperor's advance-camp."

The *amīrs* were not allowed to linger and take things leisurely. The *sazāwals* were officers, orderlies or messengers who were specially sent from Court to governors, commanders and other dignitaries of the empire to see to the enforcement and implementing of orders which had been issued to them from headquarters. They were generally "deputed to urge on and quicken the movements of dilatory commanders" (*A. N.* tr. III. 250 note).

V. 362. *l.* 11. ***Each person who sought for an increase of dignity or for an increase of his allowances, met with a favourable hearing.***

و در آن روز خان مشار الیه در حق هرکه استدعاء منصب و زیادتی علوفه
نمود بشرف قبول رسید

Lith. 305, *l.* 2 from foot; B. I. text II. 264, *l.* 5.

"And on that day, every request for promotion in rank or increment of pay, which was presented by the said Khān (Ḥusain Qulī) on behalf of any officer had the honour of being granted."

The requests or recommendations came, in the first instance, from and were submitted by Ḥusain Qulī, who was the governor of the province. They were not made by the "persons" themselves,

but by the commander-in-chief and the executive head of the provincial administration.

V. 362, *l.* 11 from foot. ***Sa'īd Khān, the ruler of Multān, was sent to his jāgīr, taking with him his brother, Makhsūs Khān, who had been promoted.***

و سعید خان حاکم ملتان رانیز رخصت جاگیر نموده برادرش مخصوص خان
را که بمزید قرب و منزلت اختصاص داشت همراه گرفتند

Lith. 306, *l.* 3; B. I. text II. 264, *l.* 11.

"Sa'īd Khān, the governor of Multān, also received permission to go to his *jāgīr*, but his brother Makhṣūṣ Khān, who stood in very high favour and enjoyed great dignity, was ordered to accompany the emperor himself."

Sa'īd Khān did not "take his brother with him." Makhṣūṣ Khān was, on the contrary, detached from him and ordered to accompany Akbar himself in the lightning march to Gujarāt.

V. 365, *l.* 14. ***Thus, in nine days, the emperor marched from Fathpur to the outshirts of Ahmadābād, a feat which it is difficult for the pen to describe.***

حضرت خلیفه الهی در عرصهٔ نه روز از فتح‌پور بشرحی که برزبان
قلم گذشت بکنار آب احمدآباد رسیدند

Lith. 308, *l.* 3; B. I. text II. 268, *l.* 8 from foot.

"His Majesty arrived, in the manner [already] described in detail by the tongue of the pen, on the bank of the river of Aḥmadābād, in nine days."

Niẓāmu-d-dīn is referring only to the itinerary of the emperor's forced march and the شرح or circumstantial account of it written by his own pen. The text contains nothing corresponding to 'a feat which it is difficult for the pen to describe.' He is only reminding his readers of what his 'pen' had already 'described.'

V. 367, *l.* 14. ***Among the prisoners taken, was a man named Mard Āzmāī Shāh, who declared himself the Koka of Mirzā Ibrāhīm Husain.***

See my note on this passage in S. I. M. H. Vol. I, 537. The B. I. text reads the sentence thus:

و از گرفتاران معرکهٔ مرد آزمای شاه مدد نام مجذوبی را که خود را
کوکهٔ ابراهیم حسین میرزا می گفت

Text II. 271, *l.* 9.

"And among the captives of that battlefield, which was a criterion of bravery, there was a half-mad santon, named Shāh Madad, who described himself as the foster brother of Ibrāhīm Ḥusain Mirzā."

مرد آزمای is not part of the name, but a phrase signifying "Trial, test or criterion of courage, virility or manliness." The lithograph reads گرفت بران instead of گرفتاران (309, *l.* 9) and makes the passage unintelligible. درین معرکه مرد آزما بظهور آمد occurs in *M. 'Ā.* 116, *l.* 3.

V. 368, *l.* 15 from foot. *When the Emperor saw it* [*the severed head of Ikhtiyāru-l-mulk*], *he praised him* [*Suhrāb Beg*] *and liberally rewarded him.*

He did nothing of the sort. He praised only God Almighty, who had given him victory.

حضرت از ملاحظه این موهبت عظمی مجدداً مراسم شکر و لوازم
سپاس بجا آورده

B. I. text II. 272, *l.* 2 from foot; Lith. 310, *l.* 4.

"His Majesty, in consideration of this great favour, once more repeated the prayers of thanks and went through the ceremony of praising (the Lord)."

The emperor is said to have "offered up his thanks for the victory vouchsafed" on p. 367. He did the same now for the second time.

V. 369, *l.* 6. *Rājā Bhagwān Dās ...... and several others were sent to Īdar, to ravage the territory which Rānā Ūdī Singh had abandoned.*

راجه بهگوانداس × × × و جمعی دیگر از بندهای را براه ایدر فرستادند
تا از میان ولایت رانا اودے سنگهه گذشته پایمال ساخته بگذرند

Lith. 310, *l.* 13; B. I. text II. 273, *l.* 8 from foot.

"Rājā Bhagwān Dās and a body of other servants were sent, by way of Īdar, so that they might, after having passed [or marched] through and devastated the territories of Rāṇā Udaya Siṁha proceed further." Budāūnī says "they were sent off, *by way of* Īdar to Āgra and Fatḥpūr, to reduce the district of Rānā Uday Singh" (II. 170; tr. II. 173).

The word is not گذاشته (abandoned), but گذشته (passed, marched through).

V. 370, *l.* 2. *The revenues of Gujarāt had not been paid up satisfactorily, so the Rājā* [*Todar Mal*] *was sent to ascertain and settle the assets and draw up an account of them for the royal exchequer.*

وچون ازجمیع ممالک گجرات از روي تحقیق بدفترخانهٔ عالي نرسیده بود
ازهمان منزل راجه تودرمل را بگجرات فرستادند تاجمع آن ولایت را
قرار واقع خاطرنشان خود نموده نسخهٔ تنقیح بدفترخانه سپارد

Lith. 311, *l.* 7; B. I. text II. 275, *l.* 1.

"And as any properly-ascertained (or verified) estimate of the (land) revenue of the territories of Gujarāt had not reached the Imperial Secretariat (lit. record-office), Rājā Todar Mal was sent from this halting place to Gujarāt and was ordered to determine the total on the basis of actually existing conditions (or circumstances) and after having assured himself (of its correctness) forward the deflated (lit. pruned, from which superfluities have been cut off, curtailed, reduced) statement to the Record-Office."

Mr. Moreland observes that Todar Mal was not sent to settle the revenue *i. e. fix* or determine "the assessment of the demand." He points out that the country had just been distributed among assignees and there was neither time nor scope for *fixing* the assessment. Todar Mal merely made a summary valuation of the assignments which had been granted and handed over his corrected estimate to the head-quarters-record office, so that it could be used by the clerks in adjusting the accounts of the assignees" (Agrarian System of Moslem India, 213).

V. 371, *l.* 6 from foot. *Sometimes even bags of money were given to these inspectors, so that they might at once estimate and satisfy the claims of the ra'iyats and farmers, and obviate any interference with the revenue collections.*

تاحق رعیت را حساب نموده بصاحب زراعت نقد داده حق دیوان را
مجری دهند

Lith. 313, *l.* 9; B. I. text 279, *l.* 4.

The last five words literally mean "so that they might allow the claims of the treasury to run as usual."

As the damage done was paid for on the spot there was nothing to set off against the state dues. The *ra'iyat* could not claim any compensation, any deduction from the amount of the revenue he was bound to pay. When there was no such cash payment, the money-value of the damage was debited to the treasury and the peasant had to recover the amount in the form of an abatement or deduction from the revenue. The new method was devised to simplify the matter. There were no debits and no abatements or deductions from the

claims of the treasury which were to run, that is, to be satisfied, in full by the *ra'iyat* or cultivator.

Dowson's phrase 'obviate any interference with the revenue collections' is needlessly negative and circumlocutory. مجرا دهند is best rendered positively.

V. 379, last line. *They went on to the river Balbhūnd, seven kos from Daryāpūr.*

According to the B. I. text they pursued the enemy upto the banks of the river of 'Palsahūnd' کنار آب پل سہوند (294, *l.* 7 from foot), but this is no improvement and leaves the matter as obscure as before (297, *l.* 7 from foot). The lithograph has پل سوند 'Palsūnd' (320, *l.* 6). Budāūnī calls it دریاچۂ پل بہوند (II. 182, *l.* 4) and Lowe speaks of it as "a small river called Balbhūnd" (tr. 185). The A. N. says, "On that fortunate day, the general public of the camp-market gathered, from the hollow of the moat, the river Pun Pun, *from a stream seven or eight kos from Daryāpūr* and from the banks of the Ganges, purses of gold and articles of armour" (III. 101; tr. III. 143).

A village called Daryāpūr still exists about two miles south of Mokāmeh, which lies about forty-five miles east of Patnā (District Gazetteer of Patna, 1907, 26, 5). Mokameh is now a railway junction.

Ghiyāṣpūr, which is mentioned on p. 380 is a *pargana* in Patna district, and lies around the *thānas* of Fatwa, Barh, Mokāmeh Bihār and Hilsā (*ibid.* 156).

V. 381, *l.* 12. *On the 9th Jumāda-s-sānī 982, he departed from Jaunpūr, and went to Khānpūr, where he stayed four days.*

A village of this name is still in existence about four miles from Jaunpūr.

Iskandarpūr (*l.* 2 from foot) is mentioned as a *maḥal* or *pargana* of *Sarkār* Jaunpūr in the *Āīn.* (tr. II. 164). There are several places of this name and it is not easy to say which is meant.

V. 385, *l.* 4. *When he reached Madāran, Rājā Todar Mal was informed that Dāūd was collecting men in Dīn-Kasārī.*

Budāūnī has درینکساری (II. 192, *l.* 2 from foot; tr. II. 195), a miswriting probably of در رنکساری '*in* Rinkasārī.' 'Rin' and 'Kassiari' are both in Mindāpore district.

'Kassiaree' lies on the Subarṇarekhā, about sixteen and twenty-five miles southwest of Kharagpūr and Midnāpore towns respectively;

Lat. 22°-8′ N., 87°-17′ E. (Th.). 'Rīn' should be read as ريبان 'Raibān' or 'Raiban', and it is also known as 'Rāibānīān'. It lies on the western bank of the Subarṇarekhā, about seven miles north of Jaleshwar (or Jellasore). Both of them are mentioned as *mahals* of the *sarkār* of Jalesar in the *Āīn.* and as 'Rayn' and 'Karāī' (or Kījāri ? 'Rayn' is there said to have had three forts (Jarrett, II. 142). They are both "ancient and famous places" and the ruins of the three forts mentioned by Abū-l-Faẓl as existing at 'Ren' can be still traced. The Subarṇarekhā was practically the northern boundary of Orissa in those times and it was at 'Raiban' or 'Rāibānīān' that "Mukunda Deva, the last independent sovereign of Orissa, made a determined but ineffectual stand against the Musulman invaders" (J. Beams, Notes on Akbar's Sūbahs—Orissa—in J. R. A. S. 1896, pp. 753-754; Midnapore District Gazetteer, edit. 1911, p. 198).

'Kassīārī' also was a place of note in those days and mosques and stone-houses erected by the Mughals are still extant in the Mughalpura quarter of the town. The old Pādshāhī road from Jahānābād in Huglī to Jaleshwar ran *via* Madāran, Chitwa, Gwālpāra, Midnāpore, Kassīārī and Gaganeshwar (Midnapore Gazetteer, p. 25). Gwālpāra, which is stated to have been ten *kos* from 'Ren-Kasārī', lies in *pargana* Kāsījora of Midnāpūr district near Pānikūrā. It is mentioned in the *Āīn.* as a *mahal* in the *Sarkār* of Jaleshwar and was also one of the seven sub-divisions in the revised *rent-roll* of Shāh Shiyāl of 1650 A. D. (M. M. Chakravarty, Geography of Orissa, J. A. S. B. 1916, p. 46).

V. 388, *l.* 10. *The Rājā (Todar Mal) and his amīrs accordingly started, and did not halt until they reached Kalkal-ghātī.*

This is most probably Kulkilla, which lies on the direct route from Lower Keonjhār to Katak. It is mentioned in the *Akbarnāmā* also in connection with Mānasiṁha's conquest of Orissa in 1592 A. D. and appears from the context to have been somewhere near Katak, as the Tīla Rājā, a great land-owner of those parts, is said to have joined Mānasiṁha and his army there (A. N. text III. 615; tr. 941). It is shown in Constable's Atlas as 'Kalkilla' (Pl. 32 D a) and lies about thirty miles north on the road from Lower Keonjhār. There was a Ghāṭ here and this is perhaps the reason for its being called Kalkalghāṭī. See also the Survey of India Map sheet No. 73 G. M. M. Chakravarti (J. A. S. B. 1916, p. 38) says it was on the Jagannāth road near Chatīā or Chitua. Kalkalakila was one of the *parganas* or fiscal divisions of Cuttack district in 1872 (W. W. Hunter, Orissa, II. Appedix IV, p. 151).

V. 390, *l.* 4. *I feel assured that His Majesty will confirm my proposition granting this to you as my tankhwāh has been granted to me.*

و حضرت خلیفہ الہي بکرم جبلي التماس مرا شرف قبول ارزانی خواهند داشت و بشما بدستوریکہ من تنخواہ میکنم عنایت خواهند فرمود

Lith. 327, *l.* 13; B. I. text II. 309, *l.* 4 from foot.

"His Majesty will, out of his inborn generosity, honour me by complying with my request and assign it [Orissa] to you as *tankhwāh* or maintenance grant, in the manner (or on the conditions) which I have suggested (proposed or recommended). According to Budāūnī, what the Khān-i-Khānān said was this: "As for the district of Bengal, a *farmān* will be sent to you, in accordance with the request which I shall make." And he states afterwards that the emperor sent "a *farmān* worded in accordance with his request," to the Khān-i-Khānān, on receiving from him a despatch containing an account of what had occurred" (II. 197, *l.* 4 from foot; tr. 200).

V. 393, *l.* 18. *Some cavillers and fault-finders made insinuations about his management of affairs.*

و بعد از مدتی حرف داغ و تجدید معاملہ داد و ستد سپاهی مذکور گشت

Lith. 329, *l.* 3 from foot; B. I. text II. 315, *l.* 5.

"And after a time when the question of introducing the *Dāgh* [the branding of horses] and the revision of the regulations relating to the amounts to be allowed to or recovered from the soldiers came to be discussed, etc."

There is nothing corresponding to 'cavillers and fault-finders' in the text. What B. states is rendered thus by Lowe: "One day, he [A'ẓam Khān] broached the subject of the new regulations about branding and the management of tax-collecting and of contracting for the army and other acts of oppression. Everything that he knew about these things he mentioned, with unqualified disapprobation" (II. 214; tr. II. 218). Abū-l-Faẓl puts it in much the same way and complains that A'ẓam "used language about the branding × × × which men of ordinary prudence would not use and was still less becoming in pure loyalists" (A. N. III. 147; tr. III. 209).

V. 399, *l.* 4 from foot. *He [Gajapati] attacked Farhat Khān and his son Mīrak Rāwī.*

میرک ردائی 'Mīrak Radāī' in the B. I. text II. 324, *l.* 5 from foot. The lithograph calls him 'Mīrak Ra*d*ānī' or 'Ra*w*ānī' (334, *l.* 11). Budāūnī agrees with the B. I. text (II. 237; tr. II. 244). But in the

Akbarnāma he is called *Farhang Khān* (A. N. III. 169; tr. III. 240-7) and Blochmann adopts this form (*Āīn*. tr. I. 400, 441, 516). *Mīrak* (میرک) is a very common personal name and can be easily misread as *Farhang* (فرهنگ). ردا means a 'cloak or mantal worn by dervishes. Perhaps this man got this nickname because he used to dress plainly like a dervish, throwing only a cloak over his shoulder. Khwāfī Khān tells a long story of "two white-bearded magicians wearing coarse woollen garments and clocks on their shoulders" دو درویش ریش سفید پشمینه پوش ردا بردوش (I. 763) who appeared in Dārā Shikoh's camp and pretended to capture Qandahār by charms and incantations. He also speaks of درویشی با عصا و ردای مشایخانه (II. 542, *l.* 7).

V. 401, *l.* 5. *After a time, he* [*Mānasiṁha*] *was forgiven and was sent at the head of a force to ravage the Rānā's country.*

بعد از چند روز قلم عفو بر تقصیرات او کشیده در مقام آن شدند
که بغارت ولایت کیکا لشکر دیگر تعین فرمایند

B. I. text II. 326, *l.* 3 from foot; Lith. 335, *l.* 9.

"After some days he drew the pen of forgiveness through his offences and determined upon the appointment of another force for the devastation of the territory of Kīkā."

Niẓāmu-d-dīn does not say that Mānasiṁha was put "at the head" of this second expedition. As a matter of fact, the campaign was directed by Akbar in person, who is said to have marched from Ajmer, to overrun and devastate the Rāṇā's territory. The subsequent dispositions of the Mughal divisions and the appointments of the commanders in different *thāṇas* or strategic points are said to have been made by the emperor himself. Mānasiṁha was restored but only as a subordinate.

V. 401, *l.* 14. *He* [*Khwāja Shāh Manṣūr*] *then entered the service of the Khān-i-Khānān Mun'im Khān at Jaunpūr and became his dīwān.*

The conversation of the Khān made his abilities known to the emperor.

V. 402, *l.* 5 from foot. *Rājā Bhagwān Dās and Saiyid 'Abdulla-Khān were left in Dhāulī-ghāṭī of Ūdīpūr.*

This 'Dhāulī-ghāṭī' appears to be another phantom toponym.

What the Lith. states is

راجه بهگوانداس وسید عبدالله خان دردهٔ کاني و اودی پور گذاشتند

336, *l.* 11.

The B. I. text says they were left at the mouth [entrance, opening] of the *Ghāṭī* of Udaypūr در دهنه گهاتی اودي پور (II. 328 last line). دهنه is often used in this sense. See my note on E. D. VII. 33, *l.* 10 in S. I. M. H. Vol. I, 631.

Budāūnī says they were stationed "at the entrance of the defile of Udaypūr" در دهنه درهٔ اودي پور تعین گردانیدند (242, *l.* 8; tr. 249).

V. 403, *l.* 5 from foot. *Shāhbāz Khān, the Mīr-Bakhshī was to check the brands of the horses and the muster of the army. The other amīrs were to exercise their diligence and secure the speedy departure of the force.*

و شهباز خان میر بخشی داغ و محلم آن لشکر را دیده و امرا را
اهتمام نموده بزودي روان سازد

Lith. 336, *l.* 4 from foot; B. I. text II. 330, *l.* 8.

"And Shāhbāz Khān, the Mīr Bakhshī after having supervised the branding of the horses of that army, was to urge on the Amīrs and see that they [lost no time and] marched expeditiously."

The 'diligence' was to be 'exercised' not by the amīrs, but by Shāhbāz Khān and the object of his appointment was "to secure the speedy departure of these dilatory commanders.

V. 406, *l* 17. *The disorders in Asīr and Burhān which the amīrs had been sent to settle being ended by the submission of Rājā 'Alī and his payment of tribute, the amīrs retired to their respective jāgīrs.*

و ازین جهت... فتوری در تشخیص مهم اسیر برهانپور ظاهر شد بنا بر آن
شهاب الدین خان و سائر امرا وسیلهٔ درخواست تقصیرات راجه علی خان
شده پیشکشهای لائق و تحف و هدایها او بدرگاه سلاطین پناه فرستاده از
ولایت اسیر و برهانپور مراجعت نموده بجاگیرهائی خود قرار گرفتند

Lith. 338, *l.* 13; B. I. text II. 333, *l.* 13.

"On account of this [the defection of Quṭbu-d-dīn Khān], contention and discord arose among the amīrs about the manner of definitely settling the affair of Asīr-Burhānpūr. Consequently, Shihābu-

d-dīn (Aḥmad Khān) and the other amīrs became intercessors for the forgiveness of the offences of Rājā 'Alī Khān and also despatched an appropriate tribute and rarities and presents from him to the emperial court. They then retreated from the kingdom of Asīr and Burhānpūr and settled down in their own *jāgīrs*." Cf. Budāūnī, II. 250; tr. II. 257.

V. 406, *l.* 7 from foot. *The emperor, ... when he reached the neighbourhood of Āmber, ordered a fort and town to be founded in the village of Multhān, one of the dependencies of Āmber.*

But the spelling in the lith. is انبرسر 'Anbarsar' (338, *l.* 2 from foot) and in the B. I. text امرسر 'Amarsar' (II. 334, *l.* 6 from foot). Āmber is only four miles north-east of Jaipur. Manoharnagar (or Manoharpūr) is situated about twenty-eight miles north-northeast of that town. 'Amarsar' is most probably right. The B. I. edition of Budāūnī has انبير in the body of the text, but 'Ambarsar' is noted as a variant by the editors (II. 251, *l.* 4 from foot and footnote).

There *is* a place called 'Amarsar' in the state of Jaipūr. It is mentioned in the Guide to Indian Post Offices and lies just about ten miles north of Manoharpūr. This must be the village intended and the reading 'Āmber' should be rejected.

V. 407, *l.* 5 from foot. *He* [*Akbar*] *was waited upon by Hājī Habībullā, who had gone to Europe and had brought with him fine goods and fabrics.*

I have pointed out in the note on this passage in S. I. M. H. Vol. I, 544-5, that ولایت فرنگ does not mean 'Europe', but the Portuguese possessions on the West Coast. It may be permissible to cite the following passages from Khwāfī Khān to reinforce the evidence on that point. He tells us in his chapter on the Niẓāmshāhīs of Aḥmadnagar, that when the prince Burhān, who afterwards ascended the throne as Burhān Niẓām Shāh II, had to fly for his life, he came out by the Konkan route to *Firangistān*, and from that place reached Aḥmadābād in Gujarāt.

از راه کونکن سر به فرنگستان بر آورده از آنجا خود را به احمد آباد
گجرات رسانید

Muntakhabu-l-Lubāb, III. 218, *l.* 1.

Elsewhere he states that

سلطان بهادر از صدمهٔ تعاقب همایون شاه راه فرنگستان دمن اختیار نمود

Ibid. III. 448, *l.* 5 from foot.

"Sulṭān Bahādur chose the road of flight towards ***Firangistān of Daman*** on account of the vigorous pursuit of Humāyūn Shāh." So Jahāngīr says that thousands of pine-apples [انناس], a fruit which grows in the Frank ports [بنادر فرنگ] were produced in his time in the Gulafshān garden at Āgra (T. J. text 3, *l.* 12; R. and B.'s tr. I. 5). The 'Frank ports' were those of Goa and Daman.

V. 408, *l.* 9 from foot. *On reaching the village of Sulṭānpūr, appertaining to Khiẓrābād, he ordered boats to be collected, so that the rest of the journey might be performed by water.*

I learn from a local official that this Sulṭānpūr is now in Sahāranpūr district and lies on the Jumnā, about four miles from the Sarsāwa railway station and seventeen miles from Khiẓrābād-i-Mashriqī near Jagadhrī in Ambālā district.

V. 411, *l.* 6. *'Alī Khān, the ruler of Kashmīr, ... sent as presents to the emperor saffron, musk, paper, shawls, etc.*

The word which is rendered 'paper' is قطاس (Lith. 342, *l.* 4; B. I. text II. 342, *l.* 11). Mr. Lowe supposes it to be 'costus Arabicus' (B. tr. 276; text 268, *l.* 2), but the real meaning is, as the *Ghiyāṣu-l-Lughāt* says, دم غژگاو 'the tail of the Tibetan Cow or *Yāk*'. These caudal appendages "formed, from remote times, the standards of the nomad tribes of Central Asia," and were also "insignia of ancient Asiatic royalty, when set in costly decorated handles and used as fly-flappers" or *Chowries* (Yule, H. J. 214). The genuine article was naturally very difficult to procure and very dear. They were consequently esteemed as presents of great price and sent to the Mughal emperors by the rulers of the countries in which they were available. Bernier tells us that when Aurangzīb was in Kashmīr, "the king of the Great Tibet × × sent to him an ambassador, with presents of the country, as Chrystal, and those dear white cowtails" (Travels, Old English translation, p. 135; Constable's Edit. 422). Lord Valentia also informs his readers with pride that he received as gifts "two beautiful Chowries, in trays which were as usual placed at my feet" (Voyages and Travels in India, 1802–1806 Vol. I. p. 428). Dowson has confounded the word with قرطاس (Greak *Khartēs*, leaf of papyrus). Lowe has mistaken it for قسط Costus. Abū-l-Faẓl says that in the neighbourhood of Thibet and Kashmīr, occurs an animal of extraordinary appearance the *Quṭās* or Thibetan Yāk. (***Āīn.*** **trans. I.**

reprint 157). Niẓāmu-d-dīn Aḥmad says that when Akbar held a great parade in honour of Mirzā Sulaimān, the elephants were adorned with قطاسهای سفید round their necks (Ṭ. A. I. B. text II. 316, *l.* 3).

V. 419, *l.* 2 from foot. *A great natural curiosity was brought to the notice of the emperor at this time. It was a man born without ears, or any orifices of the ears, who yet heard all that was spoken just like people with ears.*

A very similar case was recently the subject of a paragraph which went round the world's press. It was stated that "a pair of ears had been made in an American hospital for elevan-year-old, Johnny Doe, an orphan. He was born without exterior ears, ear drums or middle ears, but able to hear through ear-bone and auditory nerve, about as well as a normal person ordinarily hears with fingers in his ears. The artificial ears were sculptured from cartilage taken from the boy's ribs. They are natural-looking living ears" (The Sunday Standard Bombay, 28th February, 1943). Here is another. "Ezechiel Eads, of Athens, New York, who died in 1884 was born without ears. The sides of his head bore no trace of ears whatever, neither had he openings for them. However, he was able to hear through his mouth which he opened wide for the purpose". (G. Ripley; The Omnibus : Believe it or Not, p. 130). Budāūnī also mentions this "natural curiosity" and he (II. 288; tr. II. 296; E. D. V. 533) as well as Abū-l-Faẓl (A. N. III. 393; tr. 581) state that the discovery of this prodigy was the proximate cause of the experimental seclusion" of about twenty newly-born infants for about four years in a lonely house for finding out the "natural speech" or language of man.

As it is possible to hear without ears so speech is possible even after the tongue has been cut off or amputated.

V. 420, *l.* 13. *Ma'sūm spoke dutiful words to Peshrau Khān and did not show his disaffection.*

معصوم بر پیشروخان سخنان مخلصانه گفته و آثار مخالفت ظاهر کرده

Lith. 348, *l.* 8 from foot.

But مخلصانه is evidently wrong and the B. I. text rightly reads مخاطبانه (II. 356, *l.* 2). "He spoke in reproachful and violent terms and openly displayed his determination to rebel." Mr. Lowe makes Budāūnī say that he uttered "some wild speeches like a crazy man" and "went to Oude to prepare for war" (tr. II. 297) and the text has

واوسخنان پریشان مخبطانہ گفتن II. 289, *l.* 5. خبط means madness, disorder of the brain, etc. خبط دماغ is used by Niẓāmu-d-dīn for lunacy, insanity (Ṭ. A. Lith. 368, *l.* 2). See also A. N. III. 330; tr. III. 484–5, where it is said that "advice only increased his madness" and that he "came out of the screen of respect and used improper language."

V. 420, *l.* 9 from foot. *When Wazīr Khān had departed, Khwāja Manṣūr was released from confinement and again appointed to the office of dīwān.*

بعد از رخصت وزیر خان خواجہ شاہ منصور را از قید آوردہ باز بمنصب سرفراز کردند

Lith. 348, *l.* 3 from foot; B. I. text II. 356, *l.* 10.

'Departed' has many meanings and is liable to be misunderstood. The real facts are that Wazīr Khān had been appointed *Dīwān* when Manṣūr was suspended from office. But Wazīr Khān was, soon afterwards, ordered to go as one of the auxiliaries (کومکی), sent along with Ismā'īl Qulī Khān to suppress the Behār-Bengal revolt. The mobilization of Mughal territorials was not always speedily effected and every Mughal official, when transferred to a new post, had also to present himself at Court, make *Qurnish* and obtain formal permission to leave the capital to take charge of his new office of command. This was called رخصت and Manṣūr was restored only because after Wazīr Khān had had his audience of leave-taking, no other capable substitute was immediately available.

V. 422, *l.* 2. *Upon the Emperor's reaching the Sarāī of Bād, fifteen kos from Fathpur, he received intelligence.*

Bād is now a station on the Central Railway, about twenty-seven miles north-west of Āgra and six miles south of Muttra (Mathura). Fatḥpūr Sikrī lies about 23 miles south-west of Āgra. Here *kos* must be the Ilāhī *kos* of about 2½ miles. Finch speaks of 'Ba*d*eg Sara' as 22 short *kos* north of Āgra on the route to Lāhore (E. T. I. 155) and Growse suggests that the Serai is the one at Jamalpur three *kos* from Bād (Mathura 28).

V. 425 last line. *Muhammad Kāsim Khān, who had been left behind to make a bridge, had constructed one of boats. The journey to Kābul had been performed in one month. In one day he crossed the river and went on to Lāhore.*

رایات اقبال کہ در وقت رفتن کابل دریک ماہ از آب گذشتہ بود
دریک روز گذشتہ

Lith. 351, *l.* 3 from foot; B. I. text II. 362, *l.* 11 from foot.

"The standards of fortune [the Royal army] which at the time of marching *to* Kābul had taken one whole month to cross the river, now [on account of the construction of the bridge at Aṭak] crossed it in one day" (on the return journey from Kābul to Lāhore). B. also notes that "the whole army was transported by a bridge in one day" (tr. 304; text 295).

V. 428, *l.* 18. *If the government were confirmed to him, it might be the means of exciting the emulation of rulers in other countries.*

و چون گجرات باو عنایت شود سبب امیدواری حکام بلادی که در تصرف نیست میشود

Lith. 352, *l.* 14; B. I. text II. 368, *l.* 6.

"If Gujarāt were assigned to him, it might stimulate the hopes of the rulers of other provinces which had not yet come under imperial sway, *i. e.* it might induce them also to voluntarily surrender their kingdoms to Akbar in the hope of being afterwards appointed governors of the same as Akbar's deputies. If I'timād Khān, who had handed over Gujarāt, were appointed its Ṣūbahdār, other rulers might be encouraged to deliver up their own provinces, of their own free will, in the hope of obtaining a similar reward. Budāūnī states that the appointment was made "to gratify the feelings of the rulers of the Dakhin."

M. T. text II. 322 last line; Lowe tr. 332. بتقریب تالیف قلوب حکام دکن

V. 429, *l.* 19. *Bahādur Gauriya, one of the zamīndārs of Bengal, and a high officer in the army of Katlū came to see the Shaikh, who then travelled under the eyes of the zamīndārs and the servants of Katlū.*

بهادر کورفره که یکی از زمینداران بنگاله و عمدهٔ لشکر قتلو بود
با شیخ فرید یاراند از روی مساوات ملاقات نمود و شیخ بنظر
زمینداری و نوکری باو پیش آمد

Lith. 355, *l.* 3; B. I. text II. 369, *l.* 13 from foot.

"Bahādur *Kūrdah* [or Kūrūh], who was one of the *zamīndārs* of Bengal and a great leader in the army of Qatlū came forward to meet the Shaikh and comported himself as if he were his friend and equal. But the Shaikh regarded him as a mere *zamīndār* and a servant of Qatlū." *i. e.* he treated him as an inferior. The Shaikh looked upon himself as a great noble of the emperor's Court and assumed a supercilious and stand-offish attitude. Bahādur never forgot the rebuff and took his revenge by blocking up the road and attacking him when he

returned after meeting Qatlū. Budāūnī's account is that "Bahādur, coming up in very unceremoniously, wished to be hale fellow well-met with the Shaikh, but the Shaikh assumed *zamīndār-ish* (?) airs" *II*. 323, *l*. 5 from foot; tr. *II*. 333.

The sobriquet of Bahādur is written in a variety of ways and has not been elucidated. The B. I. text of the Ṭ. A. reads it as کورنره (II. 369, *l*. 10) and the lith. as کوردہ (355, *l*. 3). B. has کورنره in one place (text II. 323) and کوردہ (Kūrda) is noted as a variant. But at II. 385, it is spelt کودره (Kūdra). The *A. N.* reads it as کوروه (text III. 407, 580, 612, 615; tr. 602, 879, 936, 941). Mr. Beveridge hazards the suggestion that کورنره may be an error for کارفرما (A. N. tr. III. 602 and note). But this is as arbitrary and far-fetched an emendation and interpretation as گوریہ 'Gauriya' of Dowson. *Perhaps*, the کوردہ *Kūrdah* of the Ṭ. A. is quite right and Abū-l-Fazl's کوروه 'Kūrūh' is really meant for کوردہ 'Kūrdah'. The simple *substitution of* د *for* و may restore the name. Bahādur may have held a fief in the district of *Khūrda* under Qatlū, who was the virtual ruler of almost the whole of Orissa. Mr. Lowe notes that 'Kūrda' is found as a variant in some MSS of Budāūnī in this passage. Elsewhere also, B. stated that Bahādur *Kūdrah* کودره was the ruler of Orissa after Qatlū's death, (II. 385, *l*. 6 from foot; tr. II. 399). There, the د and ر have changed places as they often do, and it is quite easy to read کوردہ.

A zamindār was looked upon as an insignificant creature fit only to be ordered about in Mughal times. It is said of 'Isa Khān Mubīn (Manj) that he rose

از خضیض زمینداری بلندپایهٔ امارت و ایالت مرتفع گشت

Maāsiru-l-Umarā II. 836, *l*. 8.

V. 437, *l*. 7 from foot. *To Mirzā Khān, he gave the title of Khān Khānān, a horse, a robe, a Jewelled dagger and the banner of 5000 (tūman tūgh).*

و تومن توغ نیز عنایت کردند

Lith. 360, *l*. 2; B. I. text II. 379, *l*. 6 from foot.

Dowson states, in justification of his translation, that "Budāūnī makes it clear by using the words *panj hazārī*" (II. p. 336). But what that author really says is that Mirzā Khān was given along with the title of Khān Khānān and the presents, a *tūman-toq and* the rank of a commander of 5000, which was the highest dignity of amīrs" (Lowe's tr. II. 346). *The Tūmantogh* was the standard, emblem or insignia

of the highest dignity, but it was an empty honour, it brought no pay, conferred no *Manṣab* and had no fixed relation to the rank or emoluments of the donee. It also bore no fixed relation to the *manṣab* of five thousand only. It was given to prince Murād when he got the manṣab of 8000.

V. 441, *l.* 2 from foot. *Rājā 'Alī Khān .... gathered his forces and marched against 'Azdu-d-daula.*

He really marched against A'ẓam Khān, who was the commander-in-chief of the Mughal army. 'Uẓdu-d-daula had been sent to the Dekkan only because he had great influence with some of the rulers there. He was only an adviser, counsellor or peacemaker. He was there as a diplomatist or political officer, not as a general. Niẓāmu-d-dīn himself says two lines lower down,

چون راجه علی خان و لشکر دکن برسر اعظم خان آمدند

Lith. 362, *l.* 10; Bibl. Ind. text II. 384, *l.* 9 from foot.

"When Rāja 'Alī Khān and the army of the Dekkan attacked *A'ẓam Khān* (the latter went towards Berār and plundered Elichpūr)" See also A. N. text III. 489; tr. III. 740.

V. 442, *l.* 1. *On his [Rāja 'Alī Khān's] approach, 'Azdu-d-daula went to him, and sought to win him over, but he did not succeed, so he returned to Gujarāt to strengthen Khān-i-Khānān.*

و مراجعت کرده متوجه گجرات شد تا خان خانان را بکومک ببرد

Lith. 362, *l.* 10; B. I. text 384, *l.* 6 from foot.

"And he ['Uẓdu-d-daula] returned to Gujarāt, with a view to bring the Khān-i-Khānān to his [A'ẓam Khān's assistance]. He did not go to Gujarāt 'to strengthen the Khān-i-Khānān', but to bring the latter to help, assist or reinforce A'ẓam Khān in the Dekkan.

V. 447, *l.* 9. *In the year 996, the Emperor gave Gujarāt to A'zam Khān.*

So also in the Lith. 365, *l.* 11 and B. I. text II. 390, *l.* 3 from foot; but Niẓāmu-d-dīn himself gives the year 998 H. on p. 458 (Lith. 373, *l.* 7 from foot; B. I. text II. 410, *l.* 4). Abū-l-Faẓl also puts it in Dai of the 34th regnal year *i. e.* about Rabī'u-l-awwal 998 H. (A. N. III. 571, tr. III. 865). According to B., the appointment was made shortly after 20th Muḥarram 998 H. (II. 372; tr. 384).

V. 447, *l.* 9 from foot. *The thirtieth year of the reign .... now arrived.*

Neither the corresponding Hijra year nor the month nor its date is given and this has caused some confusion in regard to the commence-

ment of this and the following Ilāhī years. The 30th year began on 19th Rabī' I. 993 H., and the 31st on the 29th Rabī' I. 994, not on 19th Rabī' I. 993 as the author states on p. 448.

V. 449, *l*. 9. *He [Mirzā Muḥammad Ḥakīm] died on the 12th of Sha'bān, 993.*

The B. I. text (II. 395, *l*. 7 from foot) gives the week-day also as Friday. The Julian correspondence was Friday, 30th July, 1585 A. D. (Ind. Ephem). Abū-l-Faẓl makes it 16th Amardād of the 30th regnal year, which would be the 141st or 142nd day of the Ilāhī year and the 210th or 211th of the Julian. *i. e.* 29th or 30th July.

V. 450, *l*. 10 from foot. *The Emperor encamped at Attock on the 15th of Muharram 994.*

There are two errors here. The regnal year was not the 31st, as Niẓāmu-d-dīn makes it, but the 30th, as the latter commenced on 19th Rabī' I, 993 H. Abū-l-Faẓl gives the date of Akbar's arrival at Attock as 12th Dai of the 30th year, 23rd December, 1585 A. D. (A. N. III. 476, tr. 717). The Julian date corresponds to 11th Muḥarram (994 H.), not 15th, as it is in the text. We have another example here of the frequent confusion between پانزدهم and یازدهم in Persian manuscripts. A simple calculation will make the point clear. There is an interval of 77 days between 12th Dai and 1st Farwardīn. (17 for Dai, 30 for Bahman, 30 for Isfandārmaz = 77). But the interval between 15th Muḥarram 994 and 29th Rabī'u-l-awwal 994—the Hijra correspondence of the initial day of the 31st regnal year—is 73 days. The calculation works out right with 11th Muḥarram, as it amounts to exactly 77 (20 + 29 + 28 = 77). 11th Muḥarram 994 was equivalent to 23rd December 1585 A. D. (O.S.; Indian Ephemeris).

Budāūnī also states that "on the 11th of Muḥarram 994, Atak became the emperor's camping place" (text II. 349; tr. 360). In the Lith (368, *l*. 13) and the B. I. text II. 398, *l*. 7 the date is given as Thursday, 15th Muḥarram 995 H. where the Weekday of the month is wrong. It was Saturday, 16th December 1586 A. D.

V. 452, *l*. 16. ***This armed party ...... having beaten the black sectaries who attempted to block the road, killed many of them.***

و تاریکیان سرراه گرفته جنگ کرده شکست یافتند و بسیاری از آن ملاعین
بقتل رسیدند

Lith. 369, *l*. 10 from foot; B. I. text II. 400, *l*. 5 from foot.

"The *Tārīkīs* [i. e. followers of the Pīr-i-Raushan] blocked the road and showed fight, but they were defeated and many of those accursed ones were slain."

It is absurd to speak of the Yūsufzaīs as '*black* sectaries'. 'Tārīkī' was only a vilifying epithet or antithetical nick-name. The Yūsufzaīs are generally fair and white-skinned. Niẓāmu-d-dīn himself says a few lines higher up that "the sect of *Raushanaīs* are, in reality, *Tārīkīs* and will be hereafter called *Tārīkīs* by this pen".

طایفہ روشنائی در حقیقت عین تاریکیست و من بعد بتاریکی
B. I. text II. 399, *l.* 1 بزبان قلم خواهد رفت

V. 458, *l.* 10. *On the 8th Muharram 998, the Emperor started on his return to Hindustan.*

The lith. (373, *l.* 9 from foot) and the B. I. (text II. 410, *l.* 1) give the date as 20th بیستم and this is undoubtedly correct. Niẓāmu-d-dīn has just stated that the emperor set foot in Kābul on the 22nd of Ẓī-l-qa'da 997 H. and that he stayed two months. Abū-l-Faẓl declares that on the return journey, he encamped at Begrām (near Kābul) on 10th Āẕar 34 R. Y. *i. e.* 22nd November 1589 A. D. (A. N. III. 569; tr. 861). 20th Muḥarram 998 H. corresponded with 19th November 1589 (Ind. Eph.). B. has 20th (II. 372; tr. 383).

V. 459, *l.* 11 from foot. *The date of the battle was 6th Shawwāl, 998 H.*

The weekday also is given in the text. as Sunday. Abū-l-Faẓl gives the date as 4th Amardād of the thirty-*sixth* regnal year, which began on 24th Jumādī I, 999 H. (A. N. III. 594; tr. III. 904). Niẓāmu-d-dīn makes it *Sunday*, 6th Shawwāl 998 H. (Lith. 374, *l.* 8; B. I. text II. 411, *l.* 3 from foot) and puts the event into the thirty-fifth year. But his chronology is frequently faulty and his reckoning of the Ilāhī years is confused and self-contradictory. 4th Amardād was the 130th day of the Ilāhī year and the 199th (130 + 69) of the Julian *i. e.* 18th July 1591 A. D. 6th Shawwāl 999 H. (not 998 H.) also was Sunday 18th July 1591 A. D. The Hindu date is given as Asho *Shudi* 8 V. S. 1648 in the *Tārīkh-i-Sorath* of Ranchhodji Amarji (tr. Burgess, 251); but *Āsho* must be a mistake for *Shrāvaṇa* (See Pillai, Indian Ephemeris).

Budāūnī has copied the date 6th Shawwāl 998 H., from the Ṭ. A.; but the chronogram composed by Faiẓī which he cites (فتوحات عزیزی) yields 999 H. (II. 373; Lowe. 385).

V. 460, *l.* 18. *On the 28th Zī-l-hijja, Prince Murād .... was appointed to the Government of Mālwa.*

It is 8th in the lith. (374, *l.* 6 from foot) and also in the B. I. (text II. 413, *l.* 3). The *Akbarnāma* gives the Ilāhī date as 4th Mihr of the 36th year, 17th September, 1591 A. D. (A. N. III. 598; tr. III. 911). 8th Ẓī-l-ḥijja is correct, as it was 17th September 1591, according to the Indian Ephemeris. B. makes it 20th Ẓī-l-ḥijja (II. 378, *l.* 8; tr. 391); but بیستم must be an error for هشتم.

V. 461, *l.* 16. *This conquest of the fort of Jūnāgadh was achieved on the 5th of Zī-l-Ka'da 999 H. [36th year].*

The date is given by Abū-l-Faẓl as 17th Shahrīwar of the 37th year (A. N. III. 620; tr. III. 949). The Julian equivalent of this date would be 30th August 1592 A. D. and its Hijra correspondence 2nd Ẓī-l-ḥijja 1000 H. according to the book-rule. Niẓāmu-d-dīn has again given all the three elements of the date erroneously.

V. 464 last line. *On the 8th Muharram 1001, he [Akbar] reached Kashmīr and stayed there eight days.*

The lith. (377, *l.* 3 from foot) and the B. I. text (419, *l.* 14) prolong the duration to *twenty*-eight days and this *must be* correct, as Dowson himself states a few lines lower down, that the emperor left the province on the 6th of Ṣafar (p. 465, *l.* 4). Abū-l-Faẓl notes that Akbar reached Srīnagar on the 23rd of Mihr and started on the return march on 20th Ābān, which makes just 28 days (A. N. III. 624, 627; tr. III. 955, 959). B. says he arrived at Srīnagar on the 6th of Muḥarram 1001 H. and spent "a whole month minus two days" there (II. 384, *l.* 3 from foot; tr. 398).

V. 466, *l.* 7. *At the time when the fort of Jūnāgadh ...... was subdued, ... Sultan Muzaffar Gujarātī ...... fled and betook himself to Khangār, the zemīndār of the country of Kach.*

Here again, Niẓāmu-d-dīn has fallen into error. The fort of Jūnāgadh capitulated, according to his own statement, towards the end of 999 H. (E. D. V. 461), [correctly 1000 H.]. Khengār had died six years before in 993 H. (1585-6 A. D.), and his demise is registered in the A. N. (III. 472; tr. III. 711). 'When the fort of Jūnāgadh was subdued' Bhārmal, his son, was on the throne, and he ruled upto 1631 A. D. (Bom. Gaz. V. Cutch, p. 136). See my note on E. D. I, 268, *l.* 3 in S. I. M. H. Vol. I, 118.

V. 466, *l.* 13 from foot. *A'ẓam Khān .... had now been absent from Court for ten years.*

The lith. (378, last line) and the B. I. text (II. 422, *l.* 3) read مدت دو سال 'for a period of *two* years'. Budāūnī makes it six years (II. 387, *l.* 1; tr. 400); but neither two, nor ten, nor six is quite correct. A'ẓam Khān is known to have done homage to the emperor after his return from Ḥājīpūr on the Nauroz of the 29th R.Y. 8th Rabī' I 992 H. = 11 March 1584 A. D. (A. N. III. 431; tr. III. 644; Būdāūnī. II. 339; tr. II. 350) *i. e.* about *eight* years before the summons. He was sent to Garha and Rāisin in Mālwā in 993 H., to the Dekkan in 994 H. and was then appointed governor of Gujarāt in 998 H. (34th R. Y.). He had consequently no opportunity of coming to Court (Blochman, *Āīn.* tr. I. 326; A. N. III. tr. 655, 701, 865). He was now (1001 H.) ordered to present himself and the Ṭ. A. (Lith. 378, last line) and B. (II. 386, last line; tr. 400) write as if the command had been issued in the 38th year, but it is clear from the *Akbarnāma* that the *farmān* summoning him must have been issued at the end of the 37th R. Y. as A'ẓam Khān is there stated to have actually sailed from Verāvaḷ near Prabhās Pāṭan on the 15th of Farwardīn of the 38th Ilāhī year, 25th March, 1593 A. D. (A. N. III. 638; tr. III. 980), and to have returned after about eighteen months and paid his respects to the emperor on the 13th Āẓar of the following year (25th November 1594 A. D., *Ibid.* III. 655; tr. 1006).

V. 468, *l.* 11. *He [the Khān-i-Khānān] took leave of the Emperor at Āgra, and His Majesty returned, hunting as he went to Lāhore.*

و متوجه تسخیر دکن شده بجانب آگره متوجه گشت

Lith. 380, *l.* 4; B. I. text II. 424, *l.* 13.

"And the Khān-i-Khānān having been directed to undertake the conquest of the Dekkan, turned his face towards (*i. e.* marched towards) Āgra."

Abū-l-Faẓl states that "on the 15th [of Dai in the thirty-eighth year], the Khān-i-Khānān obtained leave near Sulṭānpūr, to depart, in order that he might assemble his troops in Āgra" (A. N. III. 648; tr. III. 996). The author of the *Maāṣir-i-Raḥīmī* also states that "the Khān-i-Khānān was directed to *proceed to Āgra*, there to collect and organise the forces, and the emperor returned homewards" (E. D. VI. 91).

V. 478, *l.* 17. *He [Būdāūnī] wrote a work on the Hadīs, called Bahru-l-Asmār, and he wrote a moral and religious work called Najātu-r-Rashīd.*

There is some confusion here. *Baḥru-l-Asmār* signifies 'Ocean of Stories', and it has neither art nor part with the *Ḥadīṣ* or Traditions of the Arabian Prophet. It was really a Persian paraphrase of an old collection of Hindu fables and stories. Budāūnī himself describes it thus, "That very day, [about 30th Ramaẓān, 1003 H.], an order was issued that I should complete the remainder of those Hindu lies, part of which had been translated by the command of Sulṭān Zainu-l-'Ābidīn, King of Kashmīr, and named the *Bahru-l-Asmār*, while the greater part had been left, untranslated" (*Muntakhabu-t-Tawārīkh*, text II. 401; tr. Lowe, II. 415). There can be little doubt that the storehouse of "Hindu lies" which poor Budāūnī had to continue was the *Kathā-Sarit-Sāgara* of Somadeva or the *Kathā-Kosha*. Lowe asserts that the *Kathā-Sarit-Sāgara* can "hardly be meant", and that the *Rāja-Taraṅgiṇī* must be the work referred to, but the latter is a full-dress history or poetical chronicle in the grand style and اسمار means only "tales, stories, fables or romances" (Richardson). Mr. Lowe's suggestion is absolutely ruled out by the fact that Budāūnī speaks elsewhere of having "rewritten in an easy style in 998 H. the *History of Kashmir*, which Mullā Shāh Muḥammad of Shāhābād × × had translated formerly into Persian." That work was undoubtedly the *Rāj-Taraṅgiṇī* (II. 374; tr. II. 386) and the order regarding it was given in 998 H. This work, the *Baḥru-l-Asmār* was commenced only in Shawwāl 1003 H. (II. 401; tr. II. 415).

The *Najātu-r-Rashīd* (Salvation of the wise) appears to have been a theological treatise or polemic. Budāūnī himself indicates the general nature of its contents when he states that he has given a full account of the doctrines and prahas of the *Mahdavīs* in that work (text I. 398, *l.* 4). Elsewhere also he tells us that he has discussed the question relating to the *muta'* marriages, which are in vogue among the Shī'as, in the *Najātu-r-Rashīd* (text II. 208; tr. II. 211-2).

V. 485, *l.* 6 from foot. *At this juncture, it occurred to the Sultān [Muḥammad Tughlaq] to raise the taxes of the inhabitants of the Doāb, ten or twenty per cent.*

The words in the original are ده بست مقرر سازند (Budāūnī, B. I. text I. 228) which mean 'should be fixed a hundred per cent higher' that is, doubled. See my note on E. D. III. 228, *l.* 11 in S. I. M. H. Vol. I. 293-4.

V. 487, l. 20. *In order that these circular instructions might be fully comprehended, the nobles were ordered to assemble every Friday in a large tent, within which was placed on an elevated chair, a pair of Salim Shāh's slippers, and a quiver full of arrows. They then bowed down before the chair.*

It is a far cry from Budāūnī to Vālmīkī and Salīm Shāh to Rāma, but it is permissible to recall that when Rāma positively refused to leave the forest, or take up the kingship, his brother Bharata requested him to insert his feet into a pair of gold-bedecked sandals which he brought with him and when Rāma had done so, carried them away to Nandigrāma as symbols which would protect the realm. He then cried to the people.

'Haste, for these sandals quickly bring,
The canopy which shades the King.
Pay ye to them all reverence meet,
As to my elder brother's feet.
For they will Law and Right maintain,
Until King Rāma comes again.'

Rāmāyana, *Ayodhyākāṇḍa*, trans. Griffith, Book II. Canto CXV. Edit. 1915, p. 224.

The once proud and contumacious Afghān nobles must have sunk low indeed under the tyranny of savage Sulṭān. There is no parallel to this debasing and humiliating ceremony in Muslim annals and one can be found only when we dig deep into the episodes of Indian proto-history or myth. At the same time, the discovery of an earlier example is interesting, as it exemplifies the extraordinary vitality of old Hindu custom and tradition.

V. 491, l. 16 from foot. *As the name of the citadel of Āgra was originally called Bādalgarh, the date, 962 was found in the words, Ātash-i-Bādalgaḍh. 'The fire of Bādal'.*

Read 'Bādalgarh' with a *Rā* and not a *dāl*. The *Abjad* value is really 963 (or 964) not 962. (1 + 400 + 300 + 2 + 1 + 4 + 30 + 20 + 200 + 5). آتش بادل گده with a '*dāl*' would yield only 767 (1 + 400 + 300 + 2 + 1 + 4 + 30 + 20 + 4 + 5).

V. 492, l. 5 from foot. *When Khān Zamān arose from his repast, he found the enemy engaged upon their meal or occupied in plundering.*

Lowe's rendering is more correct. "When Khān Zamān rose from table, the enemy found the cloth spread just as it was and began to plunder" (tr. II. 18). The sentence runs thus in the text.

زمانی کہ خان زمان از سر سفرہ برخاست غنیم سفرہ را ہمان طور
M. T. II. 25, *l.* 9 from foot. گستردہ یافت و شروع در تاراج کرد

V. 497, *l.* 14. *He arrived at last at the place where Sultān Mahmūd, nephew of Pīr Muhammad Khān was slain.*

The names in this passage have been sadly muddled in the text also (II. 125, *l.* 8 from foot). Lowe's rendering is equally incomprehensible, as he says that "Husain Khān arrived at the place where Sultān Muhammad, nephew of Pīr Mahmūd Khān, was martyred" (tr. II. 129). The reference is really to the martyr, Sālār Mas'ūd, who is said to have been the خواهرزاده nephew of the iconoclast Sulṭān Maḥmūd of Ghazna, and not of Pīr Muḥammad Khān, as Budāūnī writes that "Ḥusain Khān read the *fātiḥa* for the pure spirits of the martyrs who fell there and repaired their ***dilapidated tombs.***" Sālār Mas'ūd's mausoleum is now in Bahrāich but there are many *Ganj-i-Shahīdān* or 'mounds of martyrs' graves in the neighbouring districts also, which are locally believed to be the last resting places of his companions and the sites of the battles waged by them in their crescentade.

V. 504, *l.* 14 from foot. *The Rājā of Awesar had formed stages of wicker-work on the tops of the trees.*

راجہ اویسر با گواران تختہا بر سر درختان تعبیہ کردہ

Text II. 151, *l.* 3 from foot.

"The Rājā of Awesar had provided the villagers with planks (or platforms) on the tops of the trees."

There is nothing to justify the mention of 'wicker work' in the text. The Rājā had hidden sharpshooters in sheltered positions on the trees to snipe the Mughals for whom they had laid the ambush. The thing meant is the *machan* of Indian sportsmen. تختہ is a plank, board, panel or flat piece of timber.

V. 507, *l.* 5 from foot. *Masnad-i-'Ālī, Fattū (Katlū), the slave of 'Adalī'.*

The emendation suggested in the parenthesis is unnecessary. Fattū is the short form of 'Fatḥ' and is quite correct. He is called Fattū in the Ṭ. A. also (B. I. text II. 170, *l.* 5; E. D. V. 287).

Budāūnī mentions him as Fattū here (text II. 156; Lowe, II. 159) and also at (text II. 63; Lowe. II. 62). The title *Masnad-i-'Ālī* which is given to him by Budāūnī proves that he is the Fatḥ Khān, *Masnad-i-'Ālī* of Abū-l-Faẓl. *q. v.* Blochmann, *Āīn.* tr. I. (reprint), 564, 599, 396. A. N.

V. 510, *l.* 11. *The Mirzā* [*Ibrāhīm Ḥusain*] *heard these ceremonious words of his and said.*

Lowe has "unceremonious" (tr. II. 163). The text has سخن بی تکلفانہ (II. 159 last line). The word which has been rendered 'uncircumcised fellow' on *l.* 9 is the Turkī قلقچی which strictly means 'a man who is in service, but not in that of the king', and is loosely used for any inferior servant or menial. Here it is used in the sense of the English 'Johnny' or 'chap' or 'fellow of no account'. Dowson seems to have read it wrongly as قلفچی 'Qalafchī', قلف means 'being uncircumcised', according to Richardson's dictionary.

V. 513 *l.* 14. *When the translation was finished, I called it Khirad-afzā, a name which contains the date of the composition.*

The *abjad* value of خرد افزا is only 600+200+4+1+80+7+1 = 893. The correct chronogram is نامہ خرد افزا (text II. 184, *l.* 1; tr. II. 186), which is equivalent to 989 (50 + 1 + 40 + 5 + 893). Mr. Lowe says the title means 'Book of Mental recreation', but a more correct rendering would be 'the wisdom-increasing book.'

V. 516, *l.* 9. *The amīrs also were set free from the unseemly blandishments of the uncircumcised.*

و امرا نیز از ناز ہای بیمحل قلفچیان خلاص یافتند

B. I. text II. 191, *l.* 3 from foot.

Here again, the word should be قلقچیان and it merely means servants, followers'. Dowson's way of putting it can only mislead and confuse the reader, as it may mean that these troublesome people were Hindus, and not Muslims.

V. 518, *l.* 19. *He called the building ' ibādat Khāna, and by degrees it became at last ....*

Dowson notes that "the meaning is here doubtful, as the text has three variant readings, *'ibādat, 'iyādat* and *'ibārat-Khāna,* no one of which seems applicable." May I venture to suggest that it may be عنادة 'obstinacy, perverseness, stubbornness, wrong-headed opposition'. Elsewhere in speaking of the '*Ibādat Khāna,* Budāūnī complains that

"*innovators and schismatics* artfully started their doubts and sophistries, making right appear to be wrong and wrong to be right," (E. D. V. 527; text II. 255, *l.* 7 from foot).

Some light is thrown also on the point by the couplet which Budāūnī himself cites from a poem which Mullā Sherī had composed on the subject of the '*Ibādat Khāna*.

> In these days, I have seen united with the wealth of Qārūn,
> The ritual of Pharaoh and the buildings of Shaddād
> (tr. Lowe, II. 204; text II. 201).

V. 521, *l.* 2. *This year the King gave orders that the rent-free lands throughout his dominions, whether in the shape of ayma, madad-i-Ma'āsh, wakf or pensions should not be considered valid.*

درین سال حکم فرمودند که ایمه جمیع ممالک محروسه تا فرامین مدد معاش و اوقاف و ادرارات خویش بامضای صدر نرسانند کروریان مجری ندهند

Text II. 204, *l.* 4 from foot.

"In this year, it was ordered that so long as the *Āīma* in any part of the imperial dominions did not get the *farmāns* for their subsistence-allowances, religious endowments or pensions validated by the *Sadr*, the grants should not be passed or sanctioned by the *Krorīs*."

'*Āīma* (or *āimadār*) is a generic term and is applied here by Budāūnī to all the three sorts of beneficiaries named *Madad-i-Ma'āsh*, *waqf* and *idrār* and were different forms of charitable grants which were held by or made to the *Āīma* or *Āīmadārs*.

Āīma' is a somewhat ambiguous word, which is used in two different senses. Some authorities say that ایمّه with a *tashdīd* is the plural of the Arabic 'imām' امام (priest, religious leader). But others think that it is a Turki vocable ایمه or ایمه meaning 'food or daily allowance', خوراک و روزینه as the *Ghiyāṣu-l-Lughāt* puts it. Budāūnī favours the latter view and the *Āīma* are *Āīmadārs*, or recipients of subsistence allowances.

V. 523, *l.* 2 from foot. *His Majesty said ...... that he had only looked upon the words (Allāhu akbar) as being apposite, and there could be no sense in straining it to such an extent.*

فرمودند که × × × مقصود ما مناسبت لفظی است ازین مدعا را بآن جانب بردن چه معنی داشت

Text II. 210, *l.* 12.

Mr. Lowe translates this difficult sentence thus: "He merely looked to the propriety of the words—how could it be reasonable that his meaning should be so distorted" (tr. reprint, II. 213). Blochmann's rendering is, "he merely looked to the sound of the words, and he had never thought that a thing could be carried to such an extent" (*Āīn.* tr. I. reprint, 175 note). The difficulty lies really in the phrase مناسبت لفظی which seems to me to mean 'assonance of the words, resemblance in sound but difference in meaning, *jeu de mots*, play upon words'. Such conceits or quibbles are greatly admired in the East and Akbar says that his object was merely to suggest the *pun*, and that he never dreamt that any one would be so stupid or malicious as to think that the alternative meaning was really intended. As the whole question has been discussed at some length in my 'Historical Studies in Mughal Numismatics' pp. 81–92, it seems needless to say anything more about it here.

V. 526, *l*. 1. ***Though Hāfiz Muhammad Amīn, the preacher was constantly citing the seven imāms, urging me in high-flown language not to commit this absurdity ...... he could not persuade me.***

هرچند حافظ محمد امین خطیب از جملهٔ هفت امام بمبالغهٔ تمام میگفت
که این فضولی مکن .... بسخن او کار نکردم

Text II. 252, *l*. 9 from foot.

There is no reference to the Shī'ā Imāms (who are really twelve) and no appeal or adjuration was made in their names. This Ḥāfiẓ Muḥammad Amīn was one of the seven *imāms* or 'leaders of prayer' or 'Court chaplains' whom Akbar had appointed at this time. Budāūnī himself was one of these seven *Peshnamāz*, as they were also called.

The sentence should be translated thus: "Although Ḥāfiẓ Muḥammad Amīn—the reciter of the *Khuṭba* (or bidding-prayer)—who was one of the corps of seven *imāms* [whose duty was to take the lead in prayers] exhorted me very strongly [or insistently] not to commit this folly," (.........he could not persuade me).

V. 528, *l*. 3 from foot. ***In A. H. 983, the missionaries of Europe who are called Pādrīs .... brought their gospel to the King's notice, advanced proofs of the Trinity, and affirmed the truth and spread abroad the knowledge of the religion of Jesus.***

Mr. Lowe has rendered the last two clauses thus, "His Majesty firmly believed in the truth of the Christian religion and wished to

spread the doctrines of Jesus" (tr. 267). Mr. Vincent Smith has repeated this and aggravated the blunder by advancing the gratuitous conjecture that "the statement may be true for the time when the influence of Aquaviva was strongly felt" (Akbar, 165 note). But Budāūnī says nothing of the sort and these predications are made, not about Akbar, but about the priests or *Pādrīs*.

و دانایان مرتاض ملک افرنجه که ایشان را پادری ....
میگویند انجیل آورده و دلایل برثالث ثلاثه گذرانیده و حقیقت
Text II. 260, *l.* 1. نصرانیت اثبات کرده ملت عیسوی را ترویج دادند

The subject of the verbs اثبات کرده and ترویج دادند is دانایان مرتاض افرنجه 'the Christian priests'. Mr. Lowe has absurdly misrepresented the meaning by relating them to the emperor. Dowson's rendering is much more correct.

V. 530, *l.* 7. *He* [*Akbar*] *began also to mutter the spells which the Hindus taught him for the purpose of subduing the Sun to his wishes.*

Akbar prided himself upon being a rationalist, but he had his own superstitions and seems to have believed not only in astrology, dreams, omens from birds and beasts, and presages from the shoulder-blades of sheep, but magic and incantations. Firishta relates a curious anecdote connected with the emperor's seige of Asīrgarh, which he must have heard when he went round that fortress in 1018 A. H. in the company of Khwāja Abū-l-Ḥasan Turbatī.

"As the siege was prolonged, Akbar," he states, "ordered a body of persons who were conversant with talismans and incantations to employ their knowledge of the occult sciences for the conquest of the citadel. At the same time, he himself took up his rosary and with a view to capture the fort, repeated those names of the Glorious Luminary, which he had tested and found efficient for victory and the overthrow of adversaries."

The whole statement is so curious and Briggs' version (IV. 326) so inadequate, that it is permissible to quote the text.

اکبر بادشاه جمعي را که از طلسمات و افسون وقوف دارند مامور ساخته که
علمي چند که موجب تسخیر قلعه باشد بظهور رسانند و خود نیز به نیت کشاد
حصار تسبیح می کنند و بذکر اسامي نیر اعظم که موجب فتوحات و نگونساري
II. 290, *l.* 11. اعداست و مکرر تجربه نموده استعمال مي نماید

It would seem as if these اسامی نیراعظم were the spells which Budāūnī says "the Hindus had taught him." Elsewhere, Budāūnī declares that Akbar had "One thousand and one Sanskrit names for the sun collected and read them daily at noon, devoutly turning towards the sun; he then used to get hold of both ears, and turning himself quickly round about, used to strike the lower ends of his ears with his fists" (II. 322; tr. II. 332). Abū-l-Faẓl also refers to the matter thus : "When H. M. first came to Burhānpur," he writes, "he engaged in special acts of devotion and took to repeating the Great Name. He gave an order to the writer to send him at the end of every session, varied sweetmeats and to keep an eye on the arrangements of fate. This was excellently observed. At the end of the first session (*Khatam*) was the capture of Muẓaffar Ḥusain Mirzā. Similarly, news of victory was brought to his hearing. There was the victory of Aḥmadnagar, the death of the ring-leader of the Tārīkīs, the taking of Mālīgarh, the conquest of Asīr. Whoever considers the piety of the world's lord will not be astonished at these marvels, and will know a little out of many" (A. N. III. 782; tr. III. 1170–1171). What a satire we have here on human frailty ! Akbar and Abū-l-Faẓl openly professing their belief in capturing impregnable fortresses by *mantras* and thamaturgic mummery ! Poor Dārā Shikoh also, is said, by Khwāfī Khān, to have been induced by two sanctimonious impostors to employ magical arts for taking the fort of Qandahār and to have got nothing but derision and contempt for his credulity and folly (text I. 723). Akbar appears to have been popularly supposed to possess supernatural powers and the contemporary traveller Thomas Coryat writes that he had learned all kind of sorcery (Foster, E. T. I. 276).

V. 537, *l.* 14. *Such injunctions as one never heard of—what not to eat and a prohibition against turnips. But such is my fate to be employed on such works.*

چہ اعتراضات کہ نشنید وحرام خورم و شلغم خورم این معنی
داشت گویا نصیبۂ فقیرازین کتابہا همین بود

Text II. 320, *l.* 4 from foot.

He would be a bold man who could say what is or is not forbidden in the *Mahābhārata*, but it may be said with confidence that Budāūnī is not referring to any prohibitions in regard to turnips or any other articles of human diet. He is only bewailing his own lot and inveighing ironically against Akbar for having found fault with his

translation. "And what reproaches did I not hear? I was [called] a *Harāmkhūr* [eater of unlawful things] and a *Shalghamkhūr* [turnip-eater]. And here [in this translation] lay the origin of those words. Verily I may say that this was the only reward that fell to the lot of this humble individual for [the writing of] these books."

Budāūnī is really referring to a *contretemps* which is recorded in the annals of the 40th R. Y. He had had to translate, in his portion of the *Mahābhārata*, a discourse relating to rewards and punishments in the future life. Akbar thought that Budāūnī had interpolated something, with the object of bolstering up the Muslim belief regarding *Munkīr* and *Nakīr* and was very angry. He denounced him as an intractable and irrepressible bigot and seems to have used these abusive epithets, when complaining to Abū-l-Fazl and Naqīb Khān about it. Budāūnī himself was sent for and explained that he had only written what he had found in the book he had been ordered to translate and that he had added nothing of his own (See text II. 399-400; Lowe, II. 413). Compare also Blochmann's rendering of this sentence in *Āīn*. tr. I. reprint 111 note 2. Lowe's version is no better than Dowson's.

V. 538, l. 13. *Nightly meetings were held with some of these men [Jogis] and they used to employ themselves in various follies and extravagancies, in contemplations, gestures, addresses, abstractions and reveries and in alchemy, fascination and magic.*

ومجهولات حقایق مختلفه و اعتقادات و اشتغال و مراقبه و سلوک
اطوار و جلسات و حرکات و سکنات و خلع بدن و کیمیا و سیمیا و ریمیا
از ایشان معلوم شد

Text II. 324, *l.* 5 from foot.

"And he acquired from them a knowledge of various abstruse principles [of their philosophy] and the articles of their creed, their practices or daily exercises, their method of ecstatic contemplation, their ceremonies and rites, and also [yogic] postures, their periods of active exertion and self restraint (or rest), the power of divesting the physical body, alchemy and the occult arts called *simiyā* and *rīmiyā*".

The passage is difficult because B. is trying to render into Persian certain Sanskrit words used in the Yoga literature. His جلسات are really the 84 *āsanas* of *Haṭha Yoga* and مراقبه is *Dhyāna* and *Dhāraṇā*, intensely concentrated meditation. خلع بدن *Samādhi*, trance in which the soul leaves the body. سیمیا is the power of being present in any

place in an instant by a mere act of the will (*Ghiyāṣ*). سیمیا is the power of transferring one's soul to any other body and assuming any shape or form one pleases (*ibid*). The mystical doctrines and mysterious practices which are said to have been expounded and discussed at the seances with these ascetics are really the eight fundamental elements of *Yoga*, which are categorically stated thus in one of Patañjali's *sūtras*.

यमनियमासनप्राणायामप्रत्याहारधारणाध्यानसमाधयोऽष्टावङ्गानि ॥

"Restraint, observance, posture, regulation of the breath, abstraction, concentration, meditation and trance are the eight accessories of *Yoga*." *Yoga Sūtras*, text and trans. B. D. Basu, (Allāhābād, 1912 Chap. II. *Sūtra*. 29).

V. 539, *l*. 16. *In the month of Jumāda-l-awwal A. H. 999, I completed the translation of the Rāmāyan, having occupied four years in the work.*

As the work was entrusted to him in 992 H. (text II. 336, *l*. 16; tr. 346), 999 H. must be a mistake for 997 H. The B. I. text has سبع و تسعین و تسعمایه in words, but 999 H. in figures (366, *l*. 7). Mr. Lowe gives the date correctly as 997 H. (tr. 378) in words as well as figures.

VOL. VI. AKBAR, JAHĀNGĪR.

VI. 10, *l.* 8. *Muhammad Zamān Mirzā .... pretended to be submissive, and effecting his escape, fled to Sultān Bahādur of Gujarāt.*

This rendering is exceedingly vague and leaves out a specific detail which is mentioned in the text (I. 124). "He got out of prison by means of a forged *farmān*." (tr. I. 289). Firishta states that he conspired with the servants of Yādgār Taghāi

Text I. 213, *l.* 7 from foot. بانوکران یادگار بیگ ساختہ

Gulbadan Begam's account is that Yādgār's men united with [یکی شده] Muhammad Zamān and let him escape گریزانیدند (*Humāyūn Nāma*, text 29, *l.* 6; tr. 114). Erskine declares that he "wrought upon his keeper not only to allow him to escape, but to accompany him in his flight" (H. B. H. II. 13, 42). The forged *farmān* story is found in 'Abbās Sarwānī (E. D. IV. 351) and also in the *Makhzan* (Dorn' I. 104). It may be true, though Abū-l-Fazl and Ni'matullāh are servilely repeating what the earlier chronicler had heard. The two versions, are apparently conflicting, but they are, most probably, disjointed parts of one and the same story. The whole affair was a 'put-up job', a collusive fraud and the *farmān* was manufactured only to enable the castellan's servants to plead that they had acted under royal orders, which were honestly believed to be authentic.

As Dowson's version is both loose and mutilated, it may be as well to cite Abū-l-Fazl's own words :

و محمد زمان میرزا قدرشناسی ندانسته فرمان اباسی ظاهر ساخته

A. N. B. I. text I. 124, *l.* 8 from foot. از بند بر آمد

He did not "pretend to be submissive". What is really meant is that he did not appreciate Humāyūn's kindness in sparing his life and sending him to prison, instead of putting him to death for his treason.

VI. 11, *l.* 16. *He [Humāyūn] was informed that Sultān Bahādur .... had detached a large force under the command of Tātār Khān, who had very ambitious projects in his head.*

بمسامع علیه رسید که سلطان بهادر جمعی کثیر همراه تاتار خان کرده است و

B. I. text I. 126, *l.* 15. او باندیشه تباه خیالات فاسد در سر دارد

The 'ambitious projects' are ascribed to the wrong party. It was the Sultān of Gujarāt and not the fugitive from Dehlī who had the bee in his bonnet. Two lines lower down, Abū-l-Fazl says :

سلطان بهادر همیشه در اندیشهٔ بلند پروازی بود

"Sultān Bahādur was ever engaged in highflying imaginings" (A. N. tr. I. 293, text I. 126). Niẕāmu-d-dīn Aḥmad says that Bahādur Shāh's presumptuous audacity and overweening conceit of his own importance led him to despatch Tātār Khān Lodī to invade Bayāna and its vicinity.

و تاتار خان لودی را × × از روی کمال دلیری و زیاده سری
بتسخیر قلعه بیانه و نواحی فرستاد

Ṭ. A. Lith. 198, *l.* 4; B. I. text II. 31, *l.* 10.

VI. 13, *l.* 11. *On the 21st of Shawwāl [941 H.], Sultān Bahādur lost all hope and fled from Mandasaur.*

The date-formula is recorded with still another element of precise indication in the B. I. text. The event is there said to have taken place on the night of Sunday, the 21st of Shawwāl (I. 132; tr. I. 303). This corresponded with 25th April 1535 A. D., which did fall on a Sunday.

The *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* is probably wrong in antedating the flight of the Sulṭān by a month on the 20th of Ramaẕān (text 276 last line; tr. Bayley, 386; tr. Faẕl Luṭfullāh, 189). 20th Ramaẕān 941 H. was Thursday, 25th March 1535 A. D. (Ind. Ephem).

Hājjī Dabīr Ulugh Khānī follows or prefers the date given by Abū-l-Faẕl, as he states that the Mughals left Gujarāt on 3rd Ẕī-l-ḥijja 942 H. exactly thirteen months and thirteen days after they entered it on 21st Shawwāl 941 H. (Ẕ. W. 260, *l.* 4).

VI. 22, *l.* 2. *Hājī Khān made demands upon him, [the Rāṇā of Chitor] and grievously troubled him, so that a battle was fought between them in the vicinity of Ajmīr.*

It was just the other way. It was the *Rāṇā* Udayasiṁha, who demanded from the Afghān, not only forty *mans* of gold, but his best elephant and the most beautiful of his dancing girls (*Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Lith. 389, *l.* 8; tr. Faẕl, 279; Dorn, History of the Afghans, note on I. 108). Abū-l-Faẕl is not responsible for the error. See A. N. tr. Beveridge, II. 72 and note. Dowson has misconstrued the sentence.

VI. 22, *l.* 14. *After visiting the tomb of his father at Sirhind, he [Akbar] proceeded to Hisār, accompanied by Bairām Khān.*

I can find nothing corresponding to this *extra-ordinary* averment in the Bibl. Ind. text or translation. The Ṭ. A. and Budāūnī also

totally ignore this "visit to the tomb of his father at Sirhind." Humāyūn died in Dehli and must have been buried there. It is not easy to understand how his tomb came into existence in Sirhind. The Lucknow lithograph text seems to be responsible for the interpolation or error.

VI. 31, *l.* 16. *She [Durgāwatī] was the daughter of ...... Sālībāhan, who was Rājā of Ratāh and Mahoba.*

This 'Ratāh' must be 'Rāth' in Hamīrpūr district, U. P. Constable, 28 Ac. Mahoba is in the same district and about thirty miles south of Rāth. Rāth and Mahoba are mentioned in juxtaposition by Firishta (II. 248, *l.* 4 from foot; Briggs, tr. IV. 214).

The name 'Sukhan Dās' is written 'Sangīn Dās' in the B. I. text (II. 209; tr. II. 325), but the real name is *Gorakh* which is found in Sleeman's article (J. A. S. B. VI. 1837, p. 625). The name of the tribe to which one of the two assistants of Sukhan (?) Dās belonged (p. 32, *l.* 2) is marked by Mr. Beveridge with a query, as no such sept as 'Kharchalī' is known. May I suggest that it is a metathesis of 'Khalchuri' or 'Kalchuri', a dynasty which ruled over what was called the Chedī country in old times. "From the beginning of the eleventh Century, it (Chedī) was divided into two kingdoms. Western Chedī or Dāhala, with its capital at Tripura near Jabalpūr, and Eastern Chedī or Mahā Kośala, with its capital at Ratanpūr" (V. Smith, E. H. I. 360). The compiler of the Jubbulpore District Gazetteer states in his account of the Tribes and Castes that there are also "some Karchulias, the remains of the ancient Karchulīs who long ruled at Tewar. They are identical with the Haihayas, who, according to a legend, are descended from a snake (*ahi*) and a mare (haya)" Ed. 1909, p. 107. 'Gorakh' is most probably correct, as he is said to have founded a town called 'Gorakhpūr' which still exists near Jabalpūr, but another place of the same name is also known (Sleeman, *loc. cit.* 625 note).

VI. 38, *l.* 3. *Bhūj Hājī, Yūsuf Khān and some others.*

Delete the comma after 'Hājī' and insert it aftar 'Bhūj', reading 'Ḥājjī Yūsuf Khān'.

On *l.* 6 from foot, Bābā Khān Qāqshāl is said to "have borne back the enemy", but here again the subject and object have been confounded. The real meaning seems to be that Bābā Khān was "driven off by the enemy" (A. N. III. tr. 20; text III. 14). The Ṭ. A. (Lith. 296, *l.* 3; B. I. text II. 243, *l.* 8) and Budāūnī also (II. 142, tr. II. 146)

inform us that "Bābā Khān and his archers were compelled to fall back and made to run" تا خیلی مسافت ایشانرا دوانیدند. Dowson says in his translation of the Ṭ. A. that although Bābā Khān and his bowmen "made a stout resistance they were driven back a short distance" (E. D. V. 345).

VI. 40, *l*. 12. *Khān Muhammad Basūdī and Pāyinda Muhammad Bangash.*

Recte, Jān Muḥammad Bahsūdī. Pāyanda Muḥammad's sobriquet is given as 'Sagkash' in the B. I. text of the *A. N.* (III. 20-1; tr. III. 29). The byname is spelt in the same way on III. 411 and 412 of the text (tr. III. 611 and 612). Mr. Beveridge thinks that "the killing of pariah dogs was considered a sort of duty, or at least as a sport" and that Pāyanda was so called because he was a noted dog-killer or 'canicide' (tr. III. 1268). This farfetched explanation is suggested in the errata, but 'second thoughts' are not always better than the first. 'Sagkash' is said to be the designation of a Turkī tribe in the note on the passage (A. N. III. 612 note) and appears to be the preferable elucidation.

VI. 40, *l*. 19. *Bābā Khān Jabbārī, Mirzā Muhammad Shāh and the other Kākshāls .... had killed Shāhbāz Khān.*

Insert a comma between 'Khān' and 'Jabbārī'. Bābā Khān and Jabārī (or Jabbārī) were two distinct members of this turbulent and recalcitrant clan. Jabbārī was really the son of Majnūn Khān Qāqshāl. Bābā Khān died in the 25th year of Akbar's reign 1580 A. D. Jabbārī was alive and thrown into prison and pardoned in the 39th R. Y. (1594 A. D.) (A. N. III. 321, 650; tr. III. 470, 1000; Blochmann, *Āīn*. tr. I. 351, 370). Jabbārī is an unusual name and is really a short form of 'Jabbār Birdī'. Jabbār means 'Omnipotent, All-powerful' and is one of the many names of the Supreme Being. 'Allāhbirdī' and 'Khudābirdī' (God-given) are synonymous forms. He is called 'Jabbār Birdī' in the Ṭ. A. (Lith. 354, *l*. 10; B. I. text II. 367, last line). The name 'Jabbār Birdī' occurs also in the ***Tār. Rash.*** tr. 123-5, 127, 306, 336, 343.

The third name also in the passage has been given in a mutilated form. The right reading is "Mirzā Muḥammad, Shāh Muḥammad and other Qāqshāls" (B. I. text III. 21, *l*. 9 from foot; tr. 30).

VI. 41, *l*. 21. *He [Dāūd] made away with Yūsuf, the son of Tāj and nephew to himself,*

Correctly, 'cousin', as Tāj and 'Imād were the brothers of Sulaimān, the father of Dāūd. Cf. A. N. tr. III. 31. The word in the text is عم‌زاده (III. 21, *l.* 4 from foot).

VI. 43, *l.* 2. *He [the Rāṇā of Udaipūr] conducted Mān Singh to his own abode ...... Some treacherous designs entered the mind of the Rāṇā, but he was dissuaded from them by his well-wishers.*

واز بدگوهری درمقام عذر درآمد کہ خیرخواهان اورا نگذاشتند
ودرروان درگاه معلی وعدها درمیان آورده عذرها انگیخت

Lucknow Lith. III. 14, *l.* 12; B. I. text III. 40, *l.* 14.

But under the influence of his evil disposition, he began to make excuses saying that his well-wishers would not allow him and made promises and invented pretexts for not making a start for the imperial court.

Dowson has read غدر, but the Lucknow Lith. and the Bibl. Ind. texts agree in reading عذر and Mr. Beveridge states that the MSS also have عذر which is, most probably, what Abū-l-Faẓl wrote, as the *Iqbāl-nāma* also reads عذر, in the counterpart passage. Abū-l-Faẓl states that when Māna Siṁha arrived at Udayapūr "the Rānā had come out to welcome him and even put on the royal *Khil'at.*" The Rājā had been instructed to do his best to bring the Rāṇā to the court and his mission had all but succeeded. Pratāp had given promises to go with him, but backed out, when the time came for acting up to his word (A. N. III. tr. 57 and note).

VI. 46, last line. *He (Muzaffar Khān) drove Adham Khān Mutanabbī out of Ibrāhīmpūr, and Daryā Khān from the town of Jasarkanūr to Jhārkhand.*

'Mutanabbī' and 'Jasarkānūr' (Lucknow Lith. III. 111, *l.* 8) are manifestly doubtful and a reference to the Bibl. Ind. text shows that the names have been bungled.

آدم خان بتنی از ابراهیم پور و دریاخان کاشی از قصبهٔ چرکان بی
جنگ گریختہ بجانب جهارکند پی سپر دست ادبار شدند

133, *l.* 7 from foot.

"Ādam Khān Batanī fled from Ibrāhīmpūr without fighting and so did Daryā Khān Kāshī from Charkān, and both of them fled to Jhārkhaṇḍ" (Mr. Beveridge's tr. III. 189).

'Charkān' or 'Chargān' (variant) is the 'Chargāon' in *Sarkār* Bihār of Jarrett's translation of the *Āīn.* (II, 154). It is, most probably

'Chirkanwan', which lies, according to Thornton, 23 miles west of Gayā and 19 miles north-west of Shīrghāṭī. Lat. 24°-49′ N. Long. 84°-41′ E.

VI. 47, *l.* 14. *Mun'im Khān had left Arab Bahādur in Maher, which is a fort between Bihār and Jhārkand.*

A mahal of this name is entered in the Bihār *Sarkār* of *Ṣūba* Bihār (*Āīn.* tr. Jarrett II. 154).

VI. 48, *l.* 7. *Muzaffar Khān commanded the centre, Farhat Khān the right, and......*

According to the B. I. text, Muẕaffar was at the head of the centre, Fatḥ Khān Maidānī commanded the right wing and Farḥat Khān the left (III. 135, *l.* 3; tr. III. 191). The mistake is due to a slip in the lithograph, which gives the command of the right برانغار to Fatḥ Khān Masnad-i-'Ālī and that of the left جرانغار also to Fatḥ Khān—an obvious blunder for Farḥat فرحت Khān (III. 113, *l.* 3).

VI. 50, *l.* 4. *The inhabitants of Patna had watched the proceedings with malicious interest, but refrained from rendering the rebels any assistance, though they were filled with disappointment.*

واهل پتنه که از بدگوهری تماشاي بوده دست از معاونت کوتاه
داشتند خجلت زده آمدند

Lith. III. 116, *l.* 4; B. I. text III. 137, *l.* 15.

They were filled with shame, (خجالت) because they had withheld assistance from the Mughals, and not from their opponents the 'rebel' Afghāns.

"The people of Patna who had ill-naturedly acted only as spectators and not rendered any assistance now came with shamed faces [to make their submission]".

Abū-l-Faẕl makes his meaning abundantly clear by following up the statement with these remarks. "Had this gang regarded the world-adorning beauty of the Shāhinshāh's fortune, or possessed a share of practical wisdom, ... they would not have gone counter to the business of their benefactor, nor have been involved in so much shame" (tr. III. 194).

VI. 53, *l.* 11 from foot. *He [Todar Mal] was promoted to the dignity of diwān and to the charge of the revenue and civil affairs of the Empire.*

وخدمات ملکي و مالي براى رزان او فرمود مشرف ديوان ساختند

Lith. III. 138, *l.* 5; B. I. text III. 158,

Elsewhere, Abū-l-Faẓl states that Todar Mal was "appointed to the lofty office of head of the Dīwān (*ishrāf-i-dīwān*) and virtually the position of *Wakīl* (Prime Minister) was conferred upon him" (tr. III. 560; E. D. VI. 62; Lith. III. 368, *l.* 10; B. I. text III. 381). This shows that the old *Mushrif-i-mamlakat* or *Mushrif-i-mamālik*, was the supreme head of the Revenue and Financial departments—a sort of Chancellor of the Exchequer. The only difference was that he was now styled *Mushrif-i-Dīwān i. e. Mushrif-i-Dīwān-i-Wizārat.*

The translation is not quite accurate. Todar Mal was not 'raised to the *dignity of Dīwān*', but he was made *Mushrif-i-Dīwān i. e. Mushrif* (chief controller) of the *Dīwān*(*-i-wizārat*), the Department of Revenue and Finance.

VI. 54, *l.* 14 from foot. *Eight Kos from the fort of Sīwāna, he came to a stone fort called Dunāra.*

There is some mistake here. The real meaning is that Wīkūr (or Deokūr) was seven (or eight) *kos* from Dūnāra and not Sīwāna. Shāhbāz Khān first took Wīkūr, then Dūnāra and lastly Sīwāna (Blochmann, *Āīn.* tr. I. reprint, 437. See also A. N. III. 167, *l.* 7 from foot; tr. 237-8). The distance between Dūnāra and Sīwāna is not stated anywhere by Abū-l-Faẓl, but Dūnāra is really about thirty-five miles north-east of Sīwāna (Constable 26 D. c.).

VI. 55, *l.* 13. *In consequence of the difficulty of transporting camp equipage, Gajpati had broken out into rebellion.*

از واژونی بخت و صعوبت مداخل و دشواری مخارج راه فرمان پذیری
گذاشتن نخوت ارای شد

Lith. III. 161, *l.* 10; B. I. text III. 185, *l.* 6 from foot.

"The difficulty of the entrances into and the perilousness of the exits out of his native country" seems to be the real meaning. Mr. Beveridge renders it perhaps too tersely as the 'inaccessibility' of his country (tr. III. 260). بنگاه here means 'native place, residence'.

VI. 57, *l.* 12. *[The mint] of Gujarāt [was placed] under Khwāja 'Imādu-d-dīn Husain.*

As Mr. Vincent Smith has gone out of his way to complain that he "cannot find any other mention of this official" (Akbar, p. 157 note), it may be worth while to point out that he was the *Karorī* of Cambay who brought away fourteen *lakhs* of rupees from the treasury there to Broach when Muẓaffar III sacked the former town (T. A.

Lith. 357, *l.* 10 from foot; E. D. V. 433; A. N. III. text III. 422; tr. III. 629; B. II. 331; tr. 341).

He was the father of Ṭāhir Muḥammad, the author of the universal history called *Rauẓatu-t-Ṭāhirīn* (E. D. VI. 195–200). We also learn from an inscription in the mausoleum of Amīr Khusrav that he was the son of Sulṭān 'Alī Sabzwārī (*Āṣāru-s-ṣanādīd*, Lith. 1895, pt. I. 41; Beale, *Miftāḥ*, 84).

VI. 59, *l.* **7.** *When the Emperor was encamped on the Beyah.*

The text has بهت Behat, *i. e.* the Jhelum (Lith. III. 207, *l.* 3 from foot; B. I. text III. 243, *l.* 3; tr. III. 349).

VI. 59, *l.* **4** from foot. *Sunnīs, Shias, Brahmans, Jains, Buddhists Chārbāks...... were gathered together in the royal assembly.*

The word which stands for 'Jains' is جتی *Jatī* and جین is a misreading. 'Buddhist' is a misleading rendering of 'Sevra' سیوره (Lith. III. 215, *l.* 11; B. I. text III. 253, *l.* 2. See also tr. III. 365).

There were no Buddhists anywhere in Akbar's dominions and no professor of that faith could have been present at these discussions. 'Jatīs' and 'Seorās' are the priests of the Jainas and we know that Hīravijaya Sūri and his disciple Vijaya Sena Sūri were personally known to Akbar (Smith, Akbar 166–8). They are both mentioned in the *Āīn.* (tr. I. 538, 547) also.

VI. 71, *l.* **12.** *Mirzā Beg Kākshāl sought refuge with Tarsūn Khān in Tājpūr.*

This *may be* the place of this name in Dinājpūr, as Blochmann says (*Āīn.* tr. I. reprint 365).

VI. 72, *l.* **14.** *Another sharp battle was fought, in which .... [Ma'ṣūm] Farankhūdī was made prisoner.*

The name is قرانقدی in the Lith. III. 415, *l.* 1 and قرانقدی or قرابغدی in the B. I. text (III. 417 last line; tr. 622). There is no warrant for the prefixing of 'Ma'ṣūm' to it. Ma'ṣūm Farankhūdī had been assassinated some time before this in the XXVIIth R. Y. (A. N. III. 390; tr. III. 575–6; Ṭ. A. in E. D. V. 426 note, Blochmann. *Āīn.* tr. I. 443–4 note). This man's real name was, perhaps, Qarā and he was the son of Naqdī. A 'Naqdī Beg' is mentioned in the T. J. text, 34, *l.* 3; tr. I. 71. Farankhūd or Farankad is said to be the name of a place near Samarqand (Blochmann, *Āīn.* tr. I. 434 note).

نقدی also means 'a money changer', and may have been the trade of Qarā the father of this Ma'ṣūm.

VI. 73. l. 6. *In the times of Salīm Khān, Tāj Khān and Daryā Khān, strong armies were sent into the country, and after a severe struggle, the chief was compelled to seek a truce.*

The sentence is wrongly punctuated and an entirely wrong turn is given to the meaning.

در روزگار سلیم خان [و] تاج خان و دریا خان با فراوان سپاه بدان دیار رفتند

Lith. III. 432 last line; B. I. text 432, *l.* 8 from foot.

The و inserted between سلیم خان and تاج خان in the lith. is a manifest error and cries for deletion. "In the reign (lit. days) of Salīm Khān (*i. e.* Salīm Shāh Sūr), Tāj Khān and Daryā Khān went to that province with large armies etc." (Compare Beveridge, A. N. III. tr. 647). He follows the B. I. text (III. 432), and leaves out the adventitious copula. This Tāj Khān was, most probably, Tāg Khān Kararānī the elder brother of the better-known Sulaimān.

VI. 78, l. 11. *Ma'sūm Khān ...... proceeded to erect fortifications at Taramhānī, a place where the Ganges, the Jumnā and the Sāktī unite.*

Dowson fixes the situation of this place at some leagues below Dāccā, Mr. Beveridge contends that this identification is founded on a misinterpretation of the passage which is cited from the ***Ārāish-i-Mahfil.*** He thinks that the place meant is Trivenī in the Hooghly district, which is a well-known place of pilgrimage on the Bhagīrathī. He supposes 'Sākni' or 'Shakti' to be "another name for the Sarasvatī, which was regarded as the power or *Shaktī* of Brahmā (tr. III. 693 note). This identification ***may be*** right, but when he argues that "***Tirmohini*** must be another form of ***Tribeṇī***, because ***mohinī*** means 'enchantment', standing for a lock or braid of hair" or ***Veṇī***, he seems to be out of his depth. ***Tirmohanī*** really means 'Three ***mouths'***, and the name evidently refers to the mouths or points where the streams fall or empty into one another. The correct name is Tirmuhnī (not Tirmohinī) from ***muhn***, mouth. There are several other places called Tirmuhnī. Bābur mentions one which was at the junction of the Ganges and the Sarū, near Narhan in Sāran, Bihar (B. N. tr. 687 note). It was at this place that Khwāndamīr completed the ***Ḥabību-s-Siyar.*** That author mentions this Tirmohnī and says that *it* was at the junc-

tion of the Ganges, the Jumnā and the Sarū (E. D. IV. 156 and note), and Mr. Beveridge himself states in his note that 'Tirmohnī' means 'three *mouths*' (A. N. tr. III. 98 and note).

There is a 'Teermohonee' also in Jessore, Bengal, Lat. 22°-54′ N. Long. 89°-10′ E. (Thornton). There is a 'Trimohnī Bazar' near Kendua in Mymensingh (P. O. Guide) also. There is a Dūmuhnī in Shāhābād district (Bengal), at the junction of the Durgāvatī and Gupteshwar rivers. It is explained that the name signifies 'two *mouths*' and that the name is "applied to the spot where two rivers bifurcate or join" [Journal of Francis Buchnan, Shahabad, (1812-13), Edit. C. E. A. W. Oldham, 112-113 and note].

In a word Mr. Beveridge's justificatory derivation is worthless, even if the identification suggested by him is to be preferred.

VI. 78, foot note. "*Some leagues below Dāccā, the river* (*Ganges*) *separates into two branches*; *one called Padmāvatī runs eastward and falls into the sea at Chittagong. The other branch runs northward and divides into three streams called Sarsutī, Jumnā, and Ganges*" *Ārāish-i-Mahfil.*

It may be as well to say that the *Ārāish-i-Maḥfil* is an abridged Urdū translation or paraphrase of Sujān Rāi's *Khulāṣatu-t-tawārīkh* and is not a work of any authority (E. D. VIII, 6-7, 9). The introductory description of India in the *Khulāṣat* is only a *rifacimento* of the *Āīn.*, but the translator, Sher 'Alī, admits that his version is not literal and that he has "added or rejected as he thought proper" (E. D. VIII. 7).

In view of this admission, it seems necessary to refer to the *Āīn.* itself, as it is the original source of the information. The passage is thus translated by Jarrett: "Rising in the mountains towards the north, the Ganges ...... passes into the province of Bengal, and near Kāzīhattah (Cossimbazār) in the *Sarkār* of Bārbakābād, it divides into two streams. One of these, flowing eastwards, falls into the sea at the port of Chittāgong. At the parting of the waters, it takes the name of Padmāvatī and pursues a southern course. It is divided into three streams; one the Sarsutī, the second the Jamna (Jamuna) and the third the Ganges, called collectively in the Hindi language *Tribeṇī* and held in high veneration. The third stream, after spreading into a thousand channels, joins the sea at Sātgāon. The Sarsutī and the Jumna unite with it" (*Loc. cit.* II. 120-1). It will be seen that the *Ārāish* in

attempting to abridge the description, has muddled it fearfully and Dowson would have been well-advised to have eschewed any reference to this demonstrably garbled and mutilated extract from a second-hand compilation.

VI. 81, *l.* 6 from foot. *The Rājā [Bīrbal] and the Hakīm [Abū-l-Fath] received the command of the right and left wing.*

The author's real meaning is travestied. These commands were offered to them, but declined. The posts were assigned to Ḥasan Khān Batanī and Qāẓī 'Alī, as the Rājā and the Ḥakīm declined.

راجہ و حکیم بہمان اندیشہ از سرکردن برانغار و جرانغار سر باز زدند
سربراهی برانغار بحسن پتنی بازگشت و جرانغار بقاضی علی

Lith. III. 496, *l.* 6; B. I. text III. 483, *l.* 14; tr. III. 729.

"The Rājā and the Ḥakīm, under the influence of the same apprehension [of failure], turned their heads away from [refused] the leadership of the right and left wings. The command of the righ then reverted to Ḥasan (Khān) Batanī and that of the left to Qāẓī 'Alī.'"

VI. 82, *l.* 19. *Next day, they advanced six kos, near to Khānpūr, and there halted.*

This place cannot be satisfactorily identified. Raverty thinks that it must have been in the western part of Buner, but he admits that there is no place of that name there at the present time. If it existed in Akbar's days, it was probably "in much the same position" as Angāpūr, about two miles, S. S. E. of Tūrsak, on the direct route from the Karākar pass to the Malandaraey Kotal (Notes on Afghānistān, 262 and note).

VI. 84, *l.* 4. *In this conflict, 500 men perished.*

Elphinstone has some hard things to say about this passage. He asserts that Abū-l-Faẓl's "anxiety to soften the disgrace of Akbar's arms" has led him to whittle down the loss absurdly to only 500 men (H. I. Ed. 1866, p. 519 note). Dowson has thought it necessary to give a very different explanation and observes that this must mean one particular episode of the battle, for according to the *Ṭabaqāt*, nearly 8000 men fell. These criticisms are both founded on a misapprehension of the real meaning of the word which is rendered here by 'men'. It is کس. What the author says is در این شورش تا پانصد کس را روزگار سپری گشت (III. 487, l. 7).

كس means 'person, individual', but it has also the secondary meaning of 'person of consequence, man of note', مرد شريف. As the *Ghiyāṣ* states, كس is used for 'every body, noble and plebeian'. The phrase كس و ناكس corresponds exactly to the English expression 'somebody and nobody'. The *Anjuman Ārāi* says that كسى و ناكسي are used for مردي and نامردي, and quotes verses from Khāqānī and Ṣanāī in illustration. The 500 people killed were officers, people of note, distinguished individuals, who were well-known in the country or at Court. See Mr. Beveridge's note A. N. tr. III. 1269.

VI. 86, *l.* 11 from foot. *It was desirable to retreat to Salīmābād, where the families of his troops were and to reorganise his army there.*

Blochmann was inclined to identify this place with, and regard it as another form of Sulaimānābād, which lay some miles south of Burdwān. (*Āīn*. tr. I. 440; reprint 487). Salīmābād is in Lat. 23°-4′-50″ N. and Long. 88°-2′-45″ E. (W. W. Hunter, Statistical Account of Bengal, IV. 64).

VI. 87, *l.* 11. *Now that......Shāhbāz Khān was dead. (XXXVIth R.Y.).*

Sic. in the lith. (III. 612, *l.* 4); but it should be *Shihāb* Khān, as in the B. I. text (III. 587; tr. III. 891). Shihābu-d-dīn Aḥmad Khān died in the last quarter of the XXXVth R. Y., *i. e.* some months before the events recorded here (T̤. A. lith. 381 last line; B. II. 374; tr. II. 386; *A. N.* III. text 584; tr. 885). Shāhbāz Khān is again mentioned on pp. 91, 93 of these extracts. He died only on 1st Āẓar in the forty-fourth R. Y. (1008 H.) (*A. N.* III. 764, *l.* 9 from foot; tr. III. 1142; *Āīn*. tr. I. 401). Mr. Vincent Smith is not quite correct in asserting that "the precise date of his death is not recorded" (Akbar, 301 note). It is registered in the *Akbarnāma*. His conjecture that his "decease must have occurred towards the close of A. H. 1008" is also out by several months, as 1st Āẓar of the 44th R. Y. was 5th Jumādīu-l-awwal 1008 H. or 13th November 1599 A. D.

VI. 87, *l.* 15 from foot. *Before Lurhānu-l-mulk came near, Jamāl Khān defeated his son Isma'īl, and then hastened to attack the forces of Bījāpūr.*

جمال خان تيزدستي نموده پيشتر از آنكه برهان الملک نزديک
شود اسمعيل پور او را برداشتم بيجا نكريان شتافت

Lith. III. 612, l. 7; B. I. text 587.

بر داشتہ may mean 'drove off, held off, repelled', but the context shows that what Jamāl Khān did was to lift up, take away or carry off the young prince with a view to make use of him as a puppet or fainéant king of his own creation. The fact that Isma'īl was, after Jamāl Khān had been defeated and killed in the battle with Rājā 'Alī Khān, "brought in as a prisoner and placed in confinement" (*l*. 5 from foot) supports this interpretation. See also Firishta, Lith. II. 151–2; tr. Briggs, III. 276–281.

VI. 87, *l*. 11 from foot. *Muhammadu-l-mulk and .... other chiefs joined him.*

Recte, Amjadu-l-mulk, as in the B. I. text III. 587, *l*. 10, tr. III. 892. The lithograph is again the culprit (III. 612, *l*. 10). Firishta gives his full name as Sayyid Amjadu-l-mulk, the Mahdavī (Lith. II. 151, *l*. 13; tr. Briggs, III. 280).

VI. 87, *l*. 9 from foot. *Rājā 'Alī Khān placed Burhānu-l-Mulk in charge of the amirs of Berār and gave battle to Jamāl Khān.*

راجہ علی خان از دوربینی برهان الملک و امرای برار را دور تر
داشت و خود بکارزار در آمد

Lith. III. 612, *l*. 14; B. I. text III. 587.

"Rājā 'Alī Khān, from far-sightedness, kept Burhānu-l-Mulk and the Amīrs of Berar further off [or at a distance] and himself went forward to the battle."

Compare, tr. III. 892. Mr. Beveridge says he kept Burhān and the Berār officers "apart from one another": but there is nothing corresponding to the three last words in the text. All that is stated is that they were *all* kept at a distance from the battle-field.

VI 89, *l*. 1. *Some fighting followed, in which Mukund and his general Ishat Rāi were killed. Power then fell into the hands of Rakh Banj, but Sulaimān got him into his power and made an end of him.*

The B. I. text reads 'Jihat Rāi' and 'Durga Panj' (III. 610). 'Banj' or 'Panj' must stand for *Bhanja*, a common caste-name in Orissa. The Rājās of Keonjhār and Mayūrbhanj are still styled 'Bhanjadeva' and claim to be descended from Bhanja kings who are known to have reigned in Orissa from the eighth or ninth to the twelfth century A. D. (R. D. Banerji, History of Orissa, I. 161–188).

The history of Orissa after the death, in 1540 A. D. of Pratāparudra, the last great ruler of the Kesarī or solar dynasty, is exceedingly obscure, though some light is thrown on it by the not always reliable local chronicle of the temple of Jagannāth, the *Mādalā Pānjī*. Pratāparudra's two sons were killed in succession by the minister Govinda Vidyādhara, who founded the Bhoi dynasty, but it was short-lived and the eighteen years of its rule were marked by disorders and civil war. First, Raghu Bhanja Chhotā Rāi, the son of Govinda's sister, rebelled with the assistance of the Sūr Sulṭān of Bengal. He was defeated and driven out of the country, but Govinda died after a reign of only eight years and his two sons were put to death by the Telinga Mukunda, who usurped the throne after defeating Raghu Bhanja who had returned with an army from Bengal. This was in 1560 A.D. In 1567-8 A.D., Bāyazīd, the son, and Kālā Pahāṛ, the general, of Sulaimān Kararāni of Bengal invaded Orissa. Another Bhanja noble, Rāmachandra, the castellan of Sarangarh, then revolted and proclaimed himself king. Mukunda was routed and slain in a battle with the rebel, but the latter also was, in his turn, killed, at the same time or soon afterwards. Raghu Bhanja now escaped from the prison in which he had been confined by Mukunda and attempted to secure the empty throne, but after some four months' desultory fighting, he was captured and put to death by Kālā Pahāṛ. His death left the Afghāns masters of the country (Cuttack District Gazetteer, Edit. 1906, pp. 27-28. Banerji, *loc. cit.* I. 337-346; W. W. Hunter, Orissa, Vol. II, Appendix VII, 188-190; M. M. Chakravarti, J. A. S. B. 1900, pp. 185-189).

Phonetic resemblance is apparently in favour of identifying Abū-l-Faẓl's 'Rakh Banj' with 'Raghu Bhanja' and 'Jihata Rāi' with 'Chhoṭā Rāi'. But the *Mādalā Pānjī* gives 'Chhoṭā Rāi' as the title or honorary designation of Raghu Bhanja himself. Abū-l-Faẓl assigns the two names to two distinct individuals, who were both servants or dependants of Mukunda and proved false to him, but who gained nothing by their treason and ultimately lost their lives.

'Chhoṭā Rāi' is said to mean 'the younger Rāi', and stated to be the usual designation of the second son of every one of the principal chiefs or kings of Orissa, the eldest being styled 'Ṭikāyat' and the third 'Rāutarāya' (Banerji, I. 298 and note). It is possible that Raghu Bhanja was a 'Chhoṭā Rāi' in this sense and was the second son of some Bhanja prince who had married Govinda's sister. But then who

can be Abū-l-Faẓl's 'Jihata Rāi', who also is said to have gone over to the enemy and was killed in the course of the battle with (or against) Mukunda? It is possible that he also was the second son of some other Rājā. Perhaps he may be Rāmachandra Bhanja, the governor of Sarangarh, who is said in the *Mādalā Pānjī* to have "proclaimed himself king" and to have been slain in the battle, with (or against) Mukunda.

In the *Iqbālnāma* of Mu'tamid Khān, 'Jihata Rāi' is spelt 'Jīt Rāi' (A. N. tr. III. 934 note). Then there is also another form, 'Chhut Rāi', which occurs in the subsequent history of Orissa in connection with the *Zamīndār* or Rājā of Kailikot (Khallikot?). He had, during the viceroyalty of Khān-i-Daurān (1660–1667 A. D.), turned an out-law and rebel and "dispersed the ryots in the *pargana* of Medinīpūr, and built a fort in the jungle with evil intentions" (*Muraqqiāt-i-Hasan* quoted by Sarkār in the Journal of the Bihār and Orissa Research Society, VII. 164).

'Chhut Rāi' may be another misspelling of 'Chhota Rāi', but it may also stand for 'Chhatr' (or Chhatreshwar') Rāi. This is all that can be said and there I must leave the matter.

VI. 89 *l.* 4 from foot. *The enemy took up a position in the forests of Midnāpūr, a place in the middle of Orissa.*

The lith. has نیناپور (III. 641, *l.* 2 from foot), but it is Malnāpūr ملناپور in the B. I. text and some manuscripts read it as 'Bīnāpūr' (III. 611 and note; tr. 935). In any case, Midnāpūr is impossible, as it is not surrounded by forests, is not in the *middle* of Orissa and the name is always spelt as 'Medinīpūr' by Abū-l-Faẓl, Niẓāmu-d-dīn, Budāūnī and other Mughal historians. The form 'Midnāpūr' or 'Midnāpore' with the long 'a' is of very recent origin and of Anglo-Indian manufacture. Mr. Beams states that, the engagement took place somewhere "on the northern bank of the Subarnarekhā, probably on the same site as Mun'im Khān's victory at Tukarai or Mughalmārī" (J. A. S. B. 1883, Pt. 1, p. 236). But this is only a guess and the name of the place intended here is best left undetermined.

VI. 90, *l.* 15. *Somnāt, Koka (Goga), Mangalor, Mahū (Mahūwa), Paro (Por-bandar) and seventeen other places fell into his hands without a struggle.*

But according to the text, the total number of places taken was *sixteen*, including Somnāt, Gogā, Mahūwa and Porbandar.

سومنات و گوگہ ومنگلور و مہو پرو و دیگران تا شانزدہ بندر بی آویزش بدست درآمد

Lith. III. 651, *l.* 2 from foot; B. I. text III. 620.

Mr. Beveridge understands Abū-l-Fazl to say that "sixteen ports *in all*—including Somnāth, Ghogah and others—were taken without a contest" (tr. III. 948).

VI. 91, *l.* 1. *The keys [of the fort of Junāgadh] were given up on the 7th Shahryūr. [XXXVII R. Y.].*

So in the Lith. (III. 652, *l.* 6), but the B. I. text makes it the 17th Shahrīvar, of the 37th R. Y. The investment is said to have commenced on 23rd Khurdād and the siege to have lasted for three months (A. N. III. 620; tr. 949). The T. A. gives the Hijra date as 5th Zī-l-qa'da of the 36th R. Y. = 999 H. (Lith. 375, *l.* 10; B. I. text 414, *l.* 7) and this is reiterated by B. (II. 379; tr. 392). This date was 15th August 1591 A. D. 7th Shahrīvar of the 37th R. Y. corresponded with 19th August 1592 A. D. and 17th Shahrīvar was equivalent to 29th August 1592 A. D. 5th Zī-l-qa'da 1000 H. was 3rd August 1592 A. D. The T. A. is most probably in error in antedating the event by a year.

VI. 92, *l.* 5 from foot. *He [the Khān Khānān] met the Prince at Chānd, thirty kos from Ahmadnagar.*

So in the B. I. text III. 699, but it is disregarded by Mr. Beveridge who following the lead given by Blochmann (*Āīn.* tr. I. 335), has 'Chāndor (A. N. tr. III. 1046). But Chāndor lies about a hundred miles north of Ahmadnagar and the place intended is probably, Chāwand, which lies ten miles north-west of Junnar and ten miles south-east of the Nānā pass (B. G. Poona, Vol. XVIII; pt. III. p. 124). Junnar is about sixty miles north-west of Ahmadnagar.

Chāwand is mentioned again as 'Jūnd' in the *Bādshāhnāma* of 'Abdu-l-Hamid and Dowson's extract from it at E. D. VII. 60, *l.* 10 from foot on which see my note in this volume. It appears to have been used as a state prison by the Nizāmshāhī kings.

VI. 93, *l.* 5. *Through their negligence, an attack was made on the baggage of the army, which was with difficulty repelled, and the people of the city were encouraged by the evident signs of dissension.*

لیکن شہر نشین از دید پیمان شکنی دل برگرفت

Lith. 742, *l.* 9; B. I. text III. 699.

"But the citizens were alienated (or disheartened) when they observed the breach of faith."

As the Mughal commanders had given to many soldiers and peasants in the city assurances of safety or "safe conducts," this plundering was naturally looked upon as a breach of faith. They were not '*en*couraged' but '*dis*couraged.'

Firishta accuses Shāhbāz Khān Kambū of having deliberately instigated his own soldiers to plunder and massacre the inhabitants, as the latter were Shi'as, and he was a most bigoted Sunnī. Briggs explains the matter thus in his abstract translation or paraphrase.

"The Prince Moorad sent off a strong guard to protect the inhabitants of Boorhanabad ..... with directions to treat them with lenity, and the troops were also ordered to proclaim protection to all the natives, so that they relied entirely on the good disposition of the Moguls. ...... But Shahbaz Khan who was notorious for his tyranny and cruelty to all classes of inhabitants, mounted and under pretence of hunting, sallied forth towards Boorhanabad, and there, in spite of the Prince's orders, encouraged his men to plunder, himself setting the example; the consequence was that in the course of an hour, the towns of Ahmadnaggur and Boorhanabad were completely sacked. The Prince no sooner heard of the transaction than he ordered several of those taken with the plunder to be hanged in front of the lines; but the inhabitants, no longer relying on the faith of the Prince's promises, deserted both towns, during the night" (Briggs, tr. III. 298; text II. 159, *l*. 13).

VI 94, *l*. 7. ***Another mine which had been carried under the wall from the battery of Shāhbāz Khān, was discovered by the garrison.***

Recte, Ṣādiq Khān (Lith. III. 743, *l*. 6 from foot: B. I. text III. 700, *l*. 14 and the translation III. 1048).

VI 99, *l*. 9 from foot. ***Nasik fell into the hands of the Imperial Officers about this time.***

Here again, the real state of the case is just reversed and turned upside down. It really "fell *out of* the hands of the loyal servants of the Kingdom." از دست اولیای دولت بر آمد

Lith. III. 833, *l*. 1; B. I. text III. 774, *l*. 1; tr. III. 1156.

Nāsik had fallen *into* the hands of the Mughals some time before this, in the 44th R. Y. (A. N. B. I. text III. 751, *l*. 4 from foot; tr. III. 1123). The fact is noted also in Dowson's extracts (VI. p. 97, *l*. 18).

VI. 101, *l.* 3 from foot. *He [Abū-l-Faẓl] had joined the Khān Khānān near Barangaon.*

This name occurs as that of a *Maḥal* in Dāndesh or Khāndesh in the *Āīn*. (Tr. Jarrett. II. 225), and *may* be represented by the 'Warangaon of Constable's Atlas. Pl. 31 Ca. It is now in East Khāndesh district, about 40 miles south of Burhānpūr.

Tieffenthaler speaks of Barangaon as a village ten or eleven '*milles*' (*kos*?) to the south of another place, seven *milles* south of Burhānpūr, which is called 'Boubarli' (Description de l 'Inde. I. 308). This distance is in fair accord with the actual situation of 'Warangaon'; but I cannot make anything of 'Boubarli'. Can it be meant for Byāwal (or Yāval) which is situated hereabouts?

VI. 106, *l.* 7 from foot. *Then Ghaznī, the chief of the latter place, submitted, and the Rājā pushed on.*

The B. I. text reads the name as 'Sher Khān' (A. N. III. 809). A manuscript in the India Office has 'Sher Ghāzī.' Dowson's 'Then Ghaznī' is 'miscopied' from 'Shere Ghuzny', which is found in Lieut. Chalmers' abridged and not very reliable version of the *Akbarnāma*, which is in the Library of the Royal Asiatic Society (A. N. tr. III. 1215 note).

'Sarīpūr' (*l.* 3 from foot) is the 'Serrepore' of Ralph Fitch (Foster, E. T. I. 28 and note). Fitch went to it from Bacola (Baklā or Chandradīp in Bāqirganj). He states that it was six leagues from Sonārgāon and ruled by a Hindū called 'Choudery' [Chand Rāi, the brother of Kaid (*recte*, Kedār) Rāi]. It is really 'Srīpūr' or 'Sherpūr Firingī,' south of Idrākpūr on the Dalīsarī river, in *Pargana* Bikrampūr (Blochmann, J. A. S. B. 1872, pt. I, 230 and note). See also Dr. Wise, J. A. S. B. 1874, pt. I. pp. 202-207.

VI. 114, *l.* 4 from foot. *He [Bīr Singh Deo] was, nevertheless, pursued by Rājā Jai Singh.*

The B. I. text (III. 836, 839) has 'Rāj Singh', and it is so also in the translation (III. 1252). The person referred must be Rāj Singh Kachhwāh. He was employed in the siege of the fort of Irach and Vīra Siṁha Deva was said to have escaped by "coming out on the side of the battery of Rājā Rāj Singh" (A. N. text III. 816; tr. 1225). His promotion to the grade of 3000 is recorded on the same page and he was, afterwards, raised to that of 4000, as "he had exerted himself very much in the matter of Bīr Singh Deo Bandīla and driven him into vagabondage" (A. N. III. 839; tr. 1256).

VI. 130, *l.* **18.** *The thirty-ninth year began on the 9th Rajab.*

There is some confusion in the chronology here. The year which began on the 9th of Rajjab (1003 H.) was the fortieth R. Y. (A. N. III. 667; tr. III. 1023). The thirty-ninth R. Y. commenced really on the 28th Jumādiu-l-ākhir 1002 H. (*Ibid.* III. 649; tr. 998). The surrender of Qandahār and the arrival of Muẓaffar Ḥusain Mirzā Ṣafavī at Akbar's court took place in the 40th R. Y. and not the 39th. Shaikh Faiẓī also died in the 40th R. Y. on the 10th of Ṣafar 1004 H. (*Ibid.* III. 673; tr. 1034; Budāūnī. II. 405; tr. 420). The other event that is recorded next under the 39th R. Y. in Dowson's translation—the wounding of Akbar in the groin—really took place, according to Abū-l-Faẓl, on the 18th of Amardād of the 41st R. Y.—about the 15th Ẓī-l-ḥijja, 1004 H., not 15th Ẓī-l-qa'da. It was not during a 'stag-hunt', but at a deer-fight (A. N. III. 712; tr. III. 1061). The "great victory in the Dakhin", that is, the battle in which Rājā 'Alī Khān was slain was an event which signalised the end of the 41st R. Y. The exact date is given by Abū-l-Faẓl as 29th Bahman, 8th February 1597 A. D. (III. 719; tr. 1070). Dowson or the copyist of his MS seems to have inadvertently left out the captions of the different years and huddled the events of three regnal years under one, *viz.* those of the 39th, 40th and 41st.

VI. 133, *l.* **9.** *The work of conquest of the Dekkan, was still proceeding, when it entered the heart of Prince Salīm, that he would proceed thither to support the amīrs and to accomplish the reduction of the country. He (Prince Salīm) is already called by his subsequent regal name "Shāh Jahāngīr." Dowson's footnote.*

All this is founded on a gross misconception of the real meaning of the author. There is no reference here to 'Prince Salīm' and Dowson is quite wrong in substituting the words 'Prince Salīm' and imagining that there is any anticipation here of the regal name which he subsequently assumed. شاه جهانگیر here is not a proper name and is used in the literal sense of world-conquering king'. It is meant for and applicable to Akbar himself. What Faiẓī Sirhindī is really referring to is *Akbar's* determination to march personally to the Dekkan, as "the conquest had been retarded for five or six years by the bickerings of the Amīrs."

Prince Salīm was never sent to command in the Dekkan. His father knew him too well to entrust the task to him and the idea of undertaking any such distant enterprise could have never originated in

or entered *his* heart.' It was his gallant old father to whom it occurred and who carried it out with characteristic energy and triumphant success.

VI. 145. *l.* 9 from foot. *Among the causes which brought about the surrender of the fortress of Asīrgarh were the impurity of the atmosphere, which engendered two diseases. One was paralysis of the lower extremities, from the waist downwards......, the other was weakness of sight.*

Mr. Vincent Smith vehemently contends that the story of the deadly pestilence is "an invention intended to conceal the discreditable means adopted by Akbar to gain possession of the greatest fort in India which had been proved to be impregnable to his arms" (Akbar, 282). He accuses *Faiẓī* Sirhindī and Abū-l-Faẓl of having faked the tale (see p. 275, where it is called 'a pure invention'); but it is borne witness to by at least two other contemporary Persian historians—Firishta and Ḥājjī Dabīr Ulugh Khānī—who cannot be accused of sycophancy or even flattery, who were not the servants or dependants of Akbar and who had no object in 'inventing' a fable. Firishta, whose "well-known work" is commended by Mr. Smith as "the best Persian summary of Indian history" (Akbar, 267) explicitly declares that "Bahādur invited fifteen thousand persons into the place and filled it with horses and cattle in order that they might serve for work, and eventually food and other purposes......... The blockade of the fort continued for a length of time and the air from filth became foetid and an epidemic disease raged, caused by the number of cattle which daily died. .... Bahādur neither gave orders for the removal of the dead cattle, nor for the establishment of hospitals, nor for the removal of useless persons" (Briggs' trans. IV. 325; text II. 290, *l.* 4 *et seqq.*).

Ḥājjī Dabīr also tells us that Bahādur "had allowed so many as 18000 refugees from his kingdom with their horses and cattle to enter the fortress." The crowding was further aggravated by "the putrefaction of the vast stores of grain which the fortress contained and a pestilence broke out among men and beasts, so that large numbers perished" (Ẓafara-l-Wālih, Sir Wolseley Haig's article in Indian Antiquary, 1918, p. 181).

It may be noted that both these authors were personally acquainted with Khāndesh and had seen the fortress. Firishta states that he went round and carefully inspected it in 1023 H, and his account of

the blockade and the surrender is founded, for the greater part, on what he saw and heard then from Khwāja Abū-l-Ḥasan Turbatī and Āṣaf Khān. Ḥājjī Dabīr was employed for some time by a Khāndesh Amīr named Fūlād Khān, who had served both Rāja 'Alī Khān and Bahādur Khān Fārūqī.

At least three European writers also, who appear to have been indebted for their information to Mr. Smith's much-admired Jesuit sources, not only give a quite independet account of the origin and symptoms of the epidemic, but exaggerate its significance. William Finch who was in India about ten years after the event, assures us that "Acabar besieged Hassere a long time circling it on all sides, and at last took it by composition, for it is said that there bred such innumerable sort of emmets or other small worms in all the waters, that the people swelled and burst with drinking thereof, which mortality caused Bahadur Sha to compound and deliver it, being by mere humane force invincible" (English Travels in India, Edit. Sir W. Foster, p. 140).

Finch's account is copied almost word for word by De Laet who also speaks of the innumerable worms which live in the water of the tanks, so that those who drink the water swell up and burst asunder. This it was that brought about the surrender of the fort to Achabar (trans. Hoyland, p. 31).

Ogilby also, whose Atlas was published in 1650, declares that "Hoseer was ...... incredibly fortified by nature ...., but the water which springs out of the mountain is very unwholesome to drink, and causes worms to grow in the legs, which was the only instrument whereby Akaber conquered the place" [Atlas. V. 237. *apud* Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. XII (Khāndesh), p. 582 note].

When plague broke out in beleagured fortresses the mortality was often appalling. The Ṭ. A. assures us that when an epidemic raged during the siege of Bhakkar in 982 H., from 500 to 1000 persons died every day (B. I. text II. 235, *l*. 1; E. D. V. 339).

VI. 145, foot note. *Abū-l-Faẓl says that the pestilence arose from the penning-up of more than 100000 animals in the fortress; and that 25000 human beings died from it.*

This unfortunate observation of Dowson has given Mr. Vincent Smith a handle for another savage and atrabilious attack upon Abū-l-Faẓl. He denounces the statement attributed to Akbar's minister as

an "undoubted lie" and asserts that "such a mortality in a space of sixty acres would have converted the place into a charnel-house and the throng of people coming out for a week could not have existed" (Akbar, 282).

These vehement animadversions are misconceived and unjust and rest on an utterly unsound foundation—the mistranslation of the word which is used. جاندار really means not human beings only but 'all living creatures, animals.' The Ṭ. A. states in the account of a great hunt that

موازی پانزده هزار جاندار از آهو ونیله گاو و شغال و روباه وغیره را در آن صحرا گرد آوردند

B. I. text II. 206, *l.* 11.

Elsewhere, we find the expression چهار هزار جاندار صید کردند

Ibid. 223, l. 4 from foot.

Jahāngīr repeatedly uses the word in this sense. T. J. 89, *l.* 9; 91, *l.* 20; 243, *l.* 13 from foot; 268, *l.* 12.

Mr. Beveridge rendered it at first as 'persons' (A. N. tr. III. 1170), but notes in the Errata that it "would have been better translated by the word *animals*" (*Ibid.* 1273-4).

VI. 160, *l.* 4 from foot. *The Rāy-Rāyān reports that Nar Singh escaped through the lines of the Rājā of Gwālior.*

The person referred to is Rājasiṁha Kachhwah. He was not the '*Rājā* of Gwalior', but only the commandant or castellan of the stronghold which was in the possession of Akbar [Blochmann, *Āīn.* tr. I. (reprint), 509]. The author of the supplement to the *Akbarnāma* also indicts Rājasiṁha and states that Bīrasiṁha Deva "came out on the side of the battery of Rājā Rājasiṅgha and the Rājā showed slackness in the matter of seizing him" (A. N. text III. 816; tr. III. 1225). He afterwards made amends for his fault and was handsomely rewarded for pursuing and killing many of the followers of that "blood-stained murderer" (*Ibid.* text III. 836, 839; tr. 1252, 1256).

The 'second in command' must be Ẕiāu-l-mulk Kāsī of *l.* 12, who had been appointed Bakhshī of the army (A. N. III. 813, *l.* 6 from foot; tr. III. 1221). He should be distinguished from Ẕiāu-l-mulk Qazvīnī who was a partisan of Salīm and is mentioned by Asad Beg at p. 169 of Dowson's extracts.

VI. 180, *l.* 9. *At length, in the month of Shawwāl, in the year 963, the Humā of Humāyūn; again spread its wings over the Kingdom of Hindustān.*

This is a strange mistake for such an eminent author as Shaikh 'Abdu-l-Ḥaqq to make. Humāyūn died in Rabī' I. 963 H. He entered Lāhore on the 2nd of Rabī' II, 962 H., defeated Sikandar Sūr in a decisive battle at Sirhind on the 2nd of Sha'bān and took possession of Dehlī on the 4th of Ramaẓān of that year (Ṯ. A. Lith. 221, *l.* 12; B. I. text II. 83, *l.* 11; Erskine, H. B. H. II. 511, 518, 520). 'Abdu-l-Ḥaqq was a contemporary and he might have been expected to be less slovenly in his chronology.

VI. 191, foot note. *The account which Elphinstone gives of this disaster is in exact accordance with that here given [from the Tārīkh-i-Ḥaqqī of Nūru-l-Ḥaqq]. The authority he gives is "Muntakhabu-t-tawārīkh." Elphinstone, book II. Chapt. IX.*

This *Muntakhabu-t-Tawārīkh* is the well-known work of Budāūnī. Nūru-l-Ḥaqq has lifted the whole passage from that author. *Vide* text II. 350; Lowe's tr. 361–2.

VI. 202, *l.* 1. *Elphinstone quotes a book bearing this title [Muntakhabu-t-tawārīkh], which he says was written in 1004 H. and is probably the same work as this [of Ḥasan Khākī]. The account which Elphinstone gives of the death of Bīrbal, and for which he refers to this work is in exact accordance with that translated from Nūru-l-Hakk at p. 191. They were probably derived from a common source.*

This conjecture is wrong, The *Muntakhabu-t-tawārīkh* written in 1004 H., to which Elphinstone refers and from which his and Nūru-l-Ḥaqq's accounts of Bīrbal's death are borrowed, was the work of Budāūnī, which *was* completed in 1004 H. Ḥasan Khākī's *Muntakhab* was commenced only just "before the close of Akbar's reign" and completed after 1019 H. (p. 201 *ante*). He gives an account of the rising of Quṭb in Patna which took place in the 5th year of the reign of Jahāngīr.

VI. 204, *l.* 14. *In this year (1005 A. H.), Mirzā Rustam, son of Prince Shāh Murād died at Lahore, after a severe illness of six years and three months.*

The passage has been grossly misunderstood and misrendered. What Khākī Shīrāzī really says, is,

و درین سال میرزا رستم پسر شاه زاده مراد کم از شش سال و سه
ماه شمسي گذشته بود در لاهور وفات یافت

M. F. L. MS. 217 b, *l.* 11.

"In this year, Mirzā Rustam, the son of prince Murād, who had reached (lit. passed) the age of six solar years and three months died in Lāhore."

Abū-l-Faẓl's account is that he died at the age of "*nine* years, three months and five days" of some illness which lasted only three days (A. N. III. 735; trans. III. 1096–7).

VI. 205, *l*. 3. *The writer of this history [Khākī Shīrāzī] was sent from the neighbourhood of Dahāpūr to take charge of the office of paymaster of Gujarāt.*

I have suggested (S. I. M. H. Vol. I, p. 712) that the right reading is perhaps دهلپور Dholpūr. Faiẓī Sirhindī states that Akbar reached *Dholpūr* on the 7th of Rabī'u-s-ṣānī, 1008 H. (E. D. VI. 133). Abū-l-Faẓl tells us that "the august retinue arrived near *Dholpūr*" on 5th Ābān of the 44th regnal year (A. N. text III. 764; tr. III. 1141). Both these dates correspond with 17th October 1599 A.D.. دهاپور must be an error for دهلپور. The Hindī word for 'drum' دهول is often spelt as دهل in Persisn. Khākī Shīrāzī, the author, states that Akbar left Āgra on the 7th of Mihr or 17th September. He must have taken a month to reach Dholpūr as he was marching with an army.

VI. 205. *l*. 11. *He [Prince Salīm] plundered the treasury of Bihār, which contained three lacs of rupees.*

'Three' سه has been wrongly read for سی 'thirty'. See (A. N. text III. 773; tr. III. 1155). Muḥammad Hādī, *Dībācha* to the *Tūzuk-i-Jahāngīrī*, p. 8, *l*. 18.

VI. 247, *l*. 5 from foot. *In the year 1012 A. H., Prince Salīm was imprisoned in a bath.*

He was kept under some sort of 'open arrest' in the *Ghusal-Khāna*, which was really the privy-council chamber in the imperial residence. The year is wrongly stated. The exact date is given as Thursday 4th Āzar of the 49th R. Y., which began on the 18th of Shawwāl 1012 H. The corresponding Hijra date must have been 24th Jumādā II. 1013 H., 17th November 1604 A. D. (A. N. III. 832; tr. 1247). Khākī Shīrāzī also states that Salīm was kept under arrest for twelve days in 1013 H. (MS in the M. F. L. folio 218b. *ll*. 2–8).

VI. 285, *l*. 12. *Wine and every sort of intoxicating liquor is forbidden.*

شراب و دربهره و آنچه از قسم مسکرات منهیه باشد نسازند و نفروشند

T. J. 'Alīgarh text 4, *l*. 12.

"They should not make or sell wine or *darbahra* or any other intoxicants which are forbidden [by the religious Law]. In the translation made by Mr. A. Rogers, *darbahra* is rendered as 'rice spirit'. Its editor, Mr. Beveridge, remarks that "Jahāngīr would know little about rice-spirit", and that some MSS read '*dilbahra*, exhilarating drink' (R. and B. tr. I. 8 note). But the distillation of intoxicants from rice, *mahuwa* flowers, palm-juice, brown sugar, dates and other substances has been practised from very early times in India and Jahāngīr himself informs us that he had tasted beer [بوزه] made from rice [نان و برنج] in the time of his father in Pakhlī (E. D. VI. 371: T. J. text 291, *l.* 2; R. and B's. tr. II. 126).

Moreover, it may be permissible to doubt if دلبهره means 'exhilarating drink', بهره means 'part, share' and I have not found the word دلبهره in any dictionary. May it not be دو بهره 'two shares or parts'. The ordinary word for the country liquor sold in the bazars of Northern India is *Bevdā* 'double', because it is said to be the result of two destillations. It is in part the عرق دو آتشه 'twice-fired or double-destilled arrack' of which Jahāngīr speaks elsewhere (T. J. 64, *l.* 9, 151, *l.* 15).

V. 286, l. 5 from foot. *The aims and madad-i-ma'āsh lands, which are devoted to the purpose of prayer and praise, I confirmed. This is somewhat quaintly expressed in the original and Dowson's version will bear improvement.*

مدد معاش اهالی ائمه ممالک محروسه که لشکر دعا اند .....
برقرار و مسلم گذاشتم

T. J. 5, *l.* 3.

"The subsistence-allowances of the *Aīma* population of the imperial dominions (lit. the guarded territories) who constitute its army of prayer, I confirmed and left as they had formerly been."

A story illustrating Jahāngīr's solicitude for "the army of people who prayed for him" and his resolute determination to maintain and even increase it, is told in the *Intikhāb-i-Jahāngīrshāhī*, translated in E. D. VI. 447–448. The author of the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* relates that when Sultān Maḥmūd Khaljī of Mālwā was informed during his invasion of Gujarāt in 855 H. (1451 A. D.), that one sixth of the revenue of the province was assigned in charitable allowances as *aīma* etc., he observed that the conquest of the kingdom would be a difficult undertaking, because it had one army (of fighting men) for day and another

(of holy men who spent their time in prayer) at night" (Bombay lith. 1831, p. 66, *l.* 6 from foot; tr. Bayley, 147 and note; tr. Faẓl Luṭfullāh 33).

Abū-l-Faẓl also uses the identical phrase. He speaks of "a distinguished devotee of the age", named Mir 'Arab of Mecca, who was "keeping close to the royal stirrup of Humāyūn during the expedition to Badakhshān in 955 H. and adorning *the army of prayer* (لشکر دعا)" (A. N. I. 279; tr. I. 532). When Shāh Jahān dismissed and pensioned off Khān-i-'Ālam on account of old age, he is said to have been commanded to "pray for the perpetual duration of the emperor's good fortune" (*Bādshāhnāma* I. 1, 427, *l.* 7; see also M. U. III. 167, *l.* 10).

VI. 288, *l.* 1. ***My ancestors used to stamp the grant [for a jāgīr in proprietary right] with an Āltamghā seal, which means one to which red ink is applied.***

بمهر التمغا که عبارت از مهري است که بشنجرف میزده باشند

T. J. 10, *l.* 10.

(which) is stamped in Cinnabar (or vermilion).

شنجرف or زنجرف means 'red lead' and the Latin *Cinnabaris*, which is used for a pigment prepared from the red sulphide of mercury or red oxide of lead is derived from Pers. شنگرف or شنجرف. It is very different from the constituents of our 'red ink.'

The correct form is *Āltamghā*, with both the '*a*'*s* long. The Turkī word is *Āl* and has nothing whatever to do with the Arabic definite article, 'al'. The original meaning of تمغا is "a wooden stamp, and transit or customs duties are so called because the dutiable articles are stamped with a tamgha, a wooden stamp". B. N. tr. 250 note, *apud* Erskine Memoirs of Babar, trans. Sealing-wax is prepared from Shell-lac, oil of turpentine and cinnabar even now.

VI. 288, *l.* 12. ***Bhao Singh ...... was rewarded by a mansab of 1500, retaining his former office, and Zamāna Beg, ... had gained the dignity of 500, by serving me when I was prince as an ahadī.***

بهاوسنگه ...... بمنصب هزار و پانصدی ازاصل و اضافه ممتاز
گردانیدم زمانه بیگ که ازخورد سالي خدمت بارمن میکرد و در
ایام شاهزادگی از پله احدي بمنصب پانصدي رسیده

T. J. 10, *l.* 15.

"I bestowed upon (lit. conferred the distinction) Bhāo Singh, the rank of 1500, original and increment [the figure was made up by adding to his present or original [اصل] rank the increment or promotion [اضافہ] given to him on this occasion. The meaning is that Bhāo Singh's grade at the death of Akbar was represented by some figure lower than that of 1500, to which he was now raised by Jahāngīr. Blochmann says that Bhāo Singh was a commander of only 1000 in the last year of Akbar's reign and was gradually promoted by Jahāngīr to a *manṣab* of 5000 (*Āīn*. tr. I. 485).

Zamāna Beg had not "gained the dignity of 500 by *serving as an aḥdi*. "He had risen or been raised from the low station (پایہ step of a ladder) of an *aḥdī* to the commandership of 500, in the days when Jahāngīr was yet a prince, because he had been serving at Salīm's court from his youth upwards. He was now raised at a bound from 500 to 1500 and given the title of Mahābat Khān.

VI. 288, *l*. 6 from foot. *The details of the murder of Shaikh Abū-l-Faẓl are thus described.*

This sentence is out of place here and there is nothing corresponding to it in the text (p. 10, *l*. 9 from foot). It is, an interpolation or addition of Dowson.

VI. 289, *l*. 6. *Nar Singh Deo agreed to this [to assassinate Abū-l-Faẓl], and God rendered his aid to the success of the enterprise.*

Mr. Vincent Smith is fully justified in denouncing 'the cynical effrontery' of this passage, but he does not seem to have known that "the blasphemous ascription of success in the treacherous murder to the grace of God", is reiterated almost verbatim in the *Maāṣir-i-Jahāngīrī* of Kāmgār Khān, who also avers that the Bundela Rājā undertook the task very willingly and "assisted by the divine power, he soon waylaid the Shaikh" and slew him (E. D. VI. 443). 'Blasphemy' is a relative term and what is 'flat blasphemy' in the soldier is 'but a choleric word' in the captain. Muslim notions on the subject differ greatly from those of Christians and their modes of speech and frequent references to the supreme Being and divine assistance are liable to be misunderstood by those who look upon "taking the name of the lord in vain" as a sin or affront to the deity.

توفیق is defined in the *Ghiyāṣu-l-Lughāt* thus:

موافق گردانیدن خدا اسباب را موافق خواهش بنده تا آن
خواهش او سرانجام یابد و استعمال لفظ توفیق درهم رسیدن
اسباب امور خیر باشد نه امورات شد

Taufīq is the disposition by God of circumstance.

VI. 290, *l.* 6. *Though he* [*Akbar*] *was illiterate, yet from constantly conversing with learned and clever persons, his language was so polished, that no one could discover from his conversation that he was entirely uneducated. He understood even the elegancies of poetry and prose so well that it is impossible to conceive any one more proficient.*

The word used is امی (T. J. text 14. *l.* 12 from foot). It is used somewhat loosely for 'illiterate' and also 'imperfectly educated' or 'not very learned persons.' It is applied, for instance, to the renowned Shaikh Muḥammad Ghauṣ, whose disciple, the learned Shaikh Wajīhu-d-dīn Quraishī is said to have once thanked God that his prophet and his Pīr were both امی

[منت خدایرا که پیر من نیز مثل پیغمبر امی بودند]

Iqbālnāma, text 109, *l.* 5; M. U. II. 583.

Now Shaikh Muḥammad Ghauṣ was not, and could not have been, 'illiterate', as he is known to have written a classical treatise on magic and incantations, entitled *Jawāhir-i-Khamsa* and some books on Sūfism (B. II. 34; tr. II. 28). Humāyūn is known to have taken great pains in selecting competent tutors for his heir, and Akbar is also stated to have *read* the odes of Ḥāfiẓ with Sayyid 'Abdul-laṭīf Qazvīnī after coming to the throne.

The following observations of a learned and not too indulgent critic from overseas may bear quotation, especially as the coincidence in expression is, in places, so close that it must startle the most casual reader. Monserrate writes: "He (Akbar) is a great patron of learning and always keeps around him erudite men who are directed to discuss before him philosophy, theology and religion....... He has an excellent judgment and a good memory and has attained to a considerable knowledge of many subjects by means of constant and patient listening to such discussions. Thus he not only makes up for his ignorance (for he is entirely unable either to read or write), but he has also become able clearly and lucidly to expound difficult matters. He can give his opinion on any subject so shrewdly and keenly, that no one who did not know that he is illiterate would

suppose him to be anything but very learned and erudite" (Commentaries, tr. Hoyland p. 201).

VI. 290, *l.* 4 from foot. *As I had remitted the practice of levying transit duties ...... throughout all the protected territories, I also extended the same indulgence to all the commercial places on the way between Kābul and Hindūstān, the transit duties of which were collected annually to the amount one Kror and twenty-three lacs of dāms.*

چون زکوة ممالک محروسه را ...... معاف نموده بودم سایر جهات
کابل را نیزکه از بلاد مقرر راه هندوستان است ویک کرور و بیست
و سه لک دام جمع آن میشد بخشیدم

T. J. 21, *l.* 4 from foot.

"As I had remitted the *Zakāt* in all the imperial territories, I now remitted the *Sāir Jihāt* also of Kābul, which is one of the long-established stations (or cities) on the road to (or from) Hindūstān, [although] the aggregate amount [realised from this source] was one *Kror* and twenty-three *laks* of *dāms*. *Sāir-jihāt* or *Sāir* was a general term for miscellaneous sources of revenue. H. H. Wilson defines it as "the remaining, or all other sources of revenue accruing to the government in addition to the land-tax" (Glossary of Judicial and Revenue Terms, 185?, *s. v.*). They are in fact, as an old official publication declares, "variable imposts, distinct from land-rent or revenue, consisting of customs, tolls, licenses, duties on merchandise and other articles of personal moveable property, as well as mixed duties and taxes on houses, shops, bazars, etc." (Index and Glossary to the Regulations, edit. 1832, Vol. III. *s. v.*). See Yule and Burnell; Hobson Jobson, *s. v.* Sayer. Mr. Rogers translates *Zakāt* as 'customs duties' and *Sāir jihāt* as 'transit-duties', but neither rendering is strictly accurate.

VI. 291, *l.* 8. *Flight and Rebellion of Khusrau.*

These words stand for only a part of the caption which stands thus in the printed text.

گریختن خسرو در وسط سال اول جلوس

T. J. 23, *l.* 2 from foot.

The words 'In the first year of my accession', which have been pushed down to the following line and interjected into the body of the narrative really belong to the heading, which should be rendered thus: 'Flight of Khusrav in the middle of the first year of my accessoin."

VI. 291, *l.* 3 from foot. *Fifty horsemen in his interest came into the fort of Āgra and went off in that direction.*

با سه صد و پنجاه سواري كه با و متفق بودند ازدرون قلعه آگره برآمده متوجه ميگردد

T. J. 24, *l.* 15.

(With) *three hundred and fifty* horsemen who were in league with him, he came *out of the* fortress of Āgra and turned his face in that direction (towards the tomb of Akbar in Sikandra). The rebels did not "come *into* the fort of Āgra;" they went *out* of it.

VI. 293, *l.* 9 from foot. *Khusrū saw (this) with his own eyes .... and their atrocities [of his followers and fellow-rebels] made people feel that death was a thousand times preferable.*

خسرو بچشم خود ميديد ...... و از افعال ناشايسته اين بدبختان درساعتي هزار بار مرگ را آرزو ميكرد

T. J. 25, *l.* 4 from foot.

"Khusrav saw this with his own eyes and the sight of the outrageous deeds of these miscreants made *him* long for his (own) death a thousand times every hour."

These gloomy thoughts or wishes are ascribed to the prince himself and not to the people who were the victims of the rapine and pillage of his licentious soldiery.

VI. 293, *l.* 6 from foot. *The poor people had no resource but to join them.*

غايتاً غير از مدارا و مواسا باين سگان چاره نداشت

T. J. 25, *l.* 3 from foot.

"At all events, he [Khusrav] had no other recourse than to behave with moderation and tolerate [the proceedings of] these curs." Khusrav himself, and not the "poor people", had to put up willy-nilly with the misdeeds of the marauders.

VI. 294, *l.* 5. *His [prince Khusrav's] mother ...... took poison and died.*

The word used is ترياك (26, *l.* 5), the Greek *thēriske*, "an antidote against poisons of all sorts, but especially of wild beasts." The English 'treacle' also is derived from this Greek word and Richardson observes, in his Persian-English Dictionary, that "the treacle of Baghdād has been long esteemed as an immediate remedy for the bites of the most venomous serpents." ترياك afterwards came to be employed as an euphemism for opium, as that drug was believed

and extolled by its votaries as an infallible anodyne or panacea for all the ills of the flesh. In *l.* 19, Elliot himself makes Jahāngīr say that Khusrav's mother committed suicide by taking an "excessive dose of *opium* (افیون بسیار خورده T. J. 26, *l.* 13)".

VI. 294, *l.* 18. *But on the 26th Zī-l-Hijja 1013 H., ... she [Khusrav's mother] took an excessive dose of opium.*

The event is post-dated by just one year. The chronogram inscribed on her tomb in the Khusrav Bāgh, بخلد شد بیگم yields the date 1012 H. and 'Ināyatullāh also records it as one of the early events of the 49th year, which began on 18th Shawwāl 1012 H. He declares that she "was driven to it by the improper behaviour of the prince royal" (A. N. *Takmīla*, III. 826; tr. 1239). The text of the epigraph in the *Maqbara* will be found in Beale's *Miftāh*, 228 last line. See also Beveridge, J. R. A. S. 1907, p. 604. Khwāfī Khān (*Muntakhab*, I. 227) puts the event in 1011 H. but his chronology often leaves room for improvement.

VI. 294, *l.* 20. *She [Khusrav's mother] died soon afterwards, hoping that her fate would bring her undutiful son to contrition.*

در اندک زمانی در گذشت گویا که این احوال پسر بیدولت
خود را پیشتر می دیده است
T. J. 26, *l.* 14.

"She passed away shortly after that; one might say that she had foreseen the sorry plight to which her ill-starred son would come."

VI. 294, *l.* 2 from foot. *But the recital of all this had no effect upon Khusrū. By his wicked and unfilial conduct he had caused the death of his mother, and for no reason, ... thrown off all duty and obedience [to his father].*

غرض از ذکر این مقدمات آنکه بیسعادتی ازین در نمیگذرد که فرزندی بنابر
ناخوشی سلوک و اطوار نا پسندیده باعث قتل مادر خود شود و با
پدر خود بی هیچگونه باعثی و سببی ...... در مقام بغی و عناد آمده
از دولت ملازمتش فرار برقرار اختیار نماید
T. J. 26, *l.* 11 from foot.

"The object of mentioning these preliminary events is [to stress the fact] that no misfortune can be greater than that a son should, on account of his misconduct and evil ways, become the cause of the death of his mother and having, without cause or reason assumed a mutinous and refractory attitude towards his father, prefer flight to the felicity of remaining in his presence."

VI. 295, *l.* 3. *It was necessary to punish his evil conduct, and at last he carried matters to such a length that he was placed in confinement.*

But what the text says is this :

چون منتقم جبار هرکردارى را سزاي دربرابر نهاده مال حالش
بدان انجاميد كه بر بدترين احوالى بقيد در آمد و ...... بزندان
دايمي گرفتار گرديد

T. J. 26, *l.* 7 from foot.

As the omnipotent avenger has awarded to every misdeed its proper punishment, his conduct ultimately resulted in his being taken prisoner in the sorriest of all plights and being incarcerated for the rest of his life."

VI. 296, *l.* 9 from foot. *Seven thousand* [*rupees*] *were given to Jamīl Beg to pay arrears, and I also gave 18000 to Mīr Sharīf Āmalī.*

هفت هزار روپيه ديگر بجميل بيگ داده شدكه بايماقات تقسيم
نمايد بمير شريف آملي نيزدو هزار روپيه شفقت كردم

T. J. 28, *l.* 4 from foot.

"Seven thousand rupees were also given to Jamīl Beg so that he might distribute them among the *Aimāqs*. I bestowed two thousand [not eighteen] rupees besides on Mīr Sharīf Āmulī [for distribution to the poor]".

The text says nothing whatever about arrears. The word ايماق means 'tribe in general', and is also the specific name of certain tribes. The *Aimāqs* of Afghānistan are described by Elphinstone as living to the west of the Hazaras (Account of the Kingdom of Cabul, I. 162; II. 242-249). There were also *Aimāqs* in Badakhshān and the two or three hundred Badakhshīs whom Ḥusain Beg brought with him and who joined Khusrav are called '*Aimāqāt*' (T. J. 25, *l.* 8 from foot; tr. I. 55). Jahāngīr also had great numbers of them in his service. They were free lances ready to fight for any one who could give them good pay or hold out to them hopes of getting quickly rich by plunder and pillage. These hardy nomads were the cream of the scum of needy soldiers of fortune who flocked from Central Asia in search of military service and were highly esteemed as irregular cavalry unit. Jahāngīr had, only a few days before, ordered a sum of two thousand rupees to be paid to these mercenaries and the purpose of the grant is thus explained by himself : "considering that some of the Aimāqs attached to the royal army were in league with Khusrau, and fearing that con-

sequently some fraud or sedition might enter their minds, 2000 rupees were given to their leaders to distribute among their men and make them hopeful of the Jahāngīrī favour" (T. J. tr. I. 58; text 27, *l.* 14). It was not a payment for 'arrears', but a bribe or douceur.

Akbar had sent a troop of one thousand of these Aimāqs of Badakhshān جماعت ایماق بدخشانی که یک هزار سوار بودند (T. A. B. I. text II. 416, *l.* 12) along with the force sent to suppress the revolt of Yādgār, the bald, in Kashmīr. See also *Ibid.* 394, *l.* 12.

VI. 296, *l.* 3 from foot. *On the 24th Farwardīn, a messenger arrived from Dilāwar Khān to inform me that Khusrū was threatening Lāhore, and to warn me to be careful.*

دربیست و چهارم ماه مذکور فرستادهٔ دلاور خان میرسد و خبر میکند
که خسرو خروج نموده قصد لاهور دارد شما خبردار باشید

T. J. 29, *l.* 3.

The meaning of this passage is obscured, because Dowson has left out the sentence which precedes it. It runs thus:

دوازدهم ماه فروردین ...... میرزا حسین و نوردین قلی کوتوال
بشهر لاهور داخل میشوند

T. J. 29, *l.* 1.

"On the 12th of Farwardīn, Mīrzā Ḥusain and Nūru-d-dīn Qulī Kotwāl entered the city of Lāhore." Here, 'Farwardīn' is an obvious blunder for 'Ẓī-l-ḥijja'. The first *Julūs* year of Jahāngīr began on 11th Ẓī-l-qa'da 1014 H. and Khusrav fled on 8th Ẓī-l-ḥijja *i. e.* 27 days later. Dilāwar Khān's messenger was sent to warn, not Jahāngīr, but *the people of Lāhore.* The correct chronology seems to be as follows:

The messenger (as well as Mīrzā Ḥusain and the Kotwāl) reached Lāhore on the 12th of Ẓī-l-ḥijja, not on the 24th of Farwardīn. Dilāwar Khān himself arrived two days later on the 14th. Khusrav came up two days later on the 16th. The siege lasted for nine days from the 16th to the 24th. 'Night of the 20th' (p. 297, *l.* 2 from foot) must be a slip for 'night (Muḥammadan) of the 26th' (Sitpijja), on the noon of which day, the battle was fought. The prince was captured three days afterwards on the 29th and brought before his irate father on the 3rd of Muḥarram 1015 H.

VI. 298, *l.* 16. *An officer of the wardrobe, named Shamshīr (brought the news).*

Shamsī Tūshakchī شمسی توشکچی in the text (30, *l.* 2), and also in R. and B.'s trans. I. 63.

The litter of Khusrav is mentioned in *l.* 11 from foot and the corresponding word is spelt سنگهاسن *Singhāsan* in the ʿAlīgarh text 30, *l.* 7. But this must be an error for سکهاسن *Sukhāsan*, *q. v.* my note on E. D. V. 285, *l.* 11 from foot in S. I. M. II. Vol. I, p. 522. The '*Iqbālnāma*' speaks of the litter correctly as سکهپال سواري (B. I. text 13, *l.* 7). '*Sukhpāl*' is synonymous with '*Sukhāsan*'. Shamsī is a short form of Shamsu-d-dīn and has nothing to do with شمشیر 'sword'.

VI. 299, *l.* **6.** *Nearly 400 of the enemy were killed.*

قریب بچهارصد نفراز ایماقات در میدان پایمال قهرو غلبهٔ لشکر فیروزی اثر گردیدند

T. J. 30, *l.* 15 from foot.

Here also the word used is 'Aimāqs'. "Nearly 400 of the *Aimāqs* were trodden down by the over-powering wrath of the victorious host." They were the Badakhshī troopers of Ḥusain Beg.

VI. 299, *l.* **13.** *I would leave Mahābat Khān in Kābul and follow him thither* [*Badakhshān*], *lest he might ally himself with the Uzbeks and bring disgrace to my throne.*

خود بخیریت و دولت معاودت نمائم منشاء نرفتن بدخشان آن بود کہ آن بی سعادت البتہ باوزبکان در خواهد خورد

T. J. 31, *l.* 2.

"And I myself would return happily and triumphantly [to Āgra]. The object of *not* going on to Badakhshān was that etc. The text prefixes a negative particle to رفتن. Mr. Rogers' translation (I. 65) is in agreement with the text and there can be no doubt that the negative is required, because Jahāngīr says that the reason for *not* going to Badakhshān was that the misguided youth was sure to seek refuge with the Uzbeks. As they were sure to protect and might even give him armed assistance, reports of imminent civil war and internal disorder would be detrimental to the prestige of the empire.

VI. 300, *l.* **5.** *And the boat was taken away from the boatmen.*

و داماد کمال چوبی را کہ کشتی بدان میرانند و بزبان هند آنرا بلی میگویند از دست ملاحان کشیده کشتی را سرگردان میسازد

T. J. 31, *l.* 12 from foot.

"And the son-in-law of Kamāl took away from the boatmen the piece of wood with which boats are rowed and which is called *ballī* in the Hindī tongue and made the boat go hither and thither without control (سرگردان lit. 'giddy, wandering, straying').

In *l.* 9, Elliot states that "Ḥusain Beg got four boats and attempted to cross", but only *two* boats are said to have been found, one of which had no boatmen to row it and the other was loaded with fuel and hay. This sentence really means that the boat which Ḥusain had seized drifted *for four kos* down the river by itself, as the boatmen who had lost their poles had neither the will nor the power to navigate it. So it ran aground in a sand-bank towards the end of the night

تا چهار کروه کشتي بطور خود بپايان رويهٔ اب ميرفت تا آنكه
آخرشب در ريگ نشست

T. J. 31, *l.* 5 from foot.

Khusrav, Ḥusain and others who had boarded it were consequently bogged or marooned and soon made prisoners.

VI. 300, *l.* 5 from foot. ***Husain Beg, suspecting that they would make a scape-goat of him, began to speak sorrowfully.***

حسين بيگ بگمان آنكه شايد اورا نفعي كند سخن پريشان گفتن
آغاز كرد

T. J. 32, *l.* 19.

"Ḥusain *Beg* imagining that it would perhaps benefit him, began to utter nonsensical words". The I. N. says he indulged in "idle, frivolous and absurd talk in the hope of some imaginary gain".

بگمان نفع موهوم بهوزه گويي و ژاژخايي در آمده پريشان
گفتن آغاز كرد

B. I. text 16, *l.* 9.

He is said to have made a vain attempt to incriminate others and told Jahāngīr that most of the Amīrs of the Court were implicated in the rebellion. Mirzā 'Azīz Koka then intervened and asked the emperor not to listen to such absurdities. He pointed out that Ḥusain knew that his own fate was sealed and that he was striving only to make mischief and inculpate others. He was then ordered to shut up and the matter ended there. (*Maāṣiru-l-Umarā*, I. 567, *l.* 20; III. 359, *l.* 7; Blochmann, *Āīn.* tr. 451, 454). In *l.* 7 from foot of this page and *l.* 3, p. 301, 'Abdu-l-'Azīz' is an error for 'Abdu-r-Raḥīm.'

VI. 301, *l.* 5. ***From the last day of Zī-hijja till the 9th Muharram, in consequence of bad weather, I remained in the garden of Mirzā Kāmrān.***

The words in the text are بواسطهٔ زبونی ساعت (T. J. 32, *l.* 10 from foot) *i. e.* "on accout of the inauspiciousness of the hour". The real meaning is that the astrologers were waiting for a favourable conjunction of the planets. Jahāngīr was a great believer in astrology and speaks frequently of having entered or left Āgra and other cities at the

exact hour and minute selected by the masters of what is called horary astrology. He records among the notable events of his reign the predictions of a Hindu professor of the art to whom he had given the title of 'Jotak Rāi' *i. e.* Master of judicial astrology or the science of nativities (*Jātaka* in Sanskrit). The Dutch factor Pelsaert informed his masters thus: "The present king [Jahāngīr] generally kept one [astrologer] at Court, whose prophecies, or most of them, proved quite accurate. These brahmans have consequently acquired a great reputation, and they have now acquired over the great men, and then over all the Moslems [such influence] that they will not undertake a journey until they have inquired what day or hour is auspicious for the start, and when they return from a journey or come to take up an appointment, they will not enter the city until the suitable day or hour had been predicted, and then they wait until the exact moment has arrived" (Jahāngīr's India or the Remonstratie; tr. Moreland and Geyl. p. 77). Bernier actually uses this word ساعت more than once in exactly the same sense. "In every enterprise," he complains, "they [Asiatics] consult their astrologers. When two armies have completed their preparations for battle, no consideration can induce the generals to commence the engagement until the 'Sahet' be performed, that is, until the propitious moment for attack be ascertained" (Ed. Constable, 1891, p. 161). And elsewhere he writes that the "Kings' crafty diviners read whatever is written in heaven and fix upon the Sahet" (*Ibid.* 245. See also p. 163, See also Sarkār, H. A. V. 461-2). Abū-l-Fazl also has left it on record that Akbar "halted for three days at Bachūna, eight *kos* from Fathpūr, in the 17th year, because Jotak Rāi represented that *after three days*, there would be an auspicious time for entering the capital" (A. N. III. 38; tr. III. 54).

As Mr. Beveridge also says in a note that "the meaning may be that the weather was bad" (T. J. tr. I. 69 note), it may be permissible to refer to other passages where ساعت is used by Jahāngīr for (propitious) time or hour.

T. J. 122, *l*. 5. امشب ساعت توجه بجانب اجمیر اختیار نموده بودند

125, *l*. 13. ششم دی که اختیار ساعت شده بود

چون روز دوشنبه ساعت بجهت در آمدن شهر اختیار شده بود

209, *l*. 21.

بساعت سعادت قرین که منجمان و اختر شناسان اختیار نموده بودند

268, *l*. 12 from foot. See also 162, *l*. 12 from foot.

اختیار ساعت is used in the Ṭ. A. for "the choice of the propitious hour" (B. I. text II. 256, *l.* 8). زبونی بخت (ill luck) occurs at *Ibid* I. 298, *l.* 6 and زبونی طالع in Firishta, II. 290, *l.* 3 and ساعت سعود is used in the Ṭ. A. (B. I. text II. 276, *l.* 2) as the antithesis of ساعت زبون

VI. 301, *l.* 11 from foot. *So I directed my son Parwīz .... to proceed himself with Āsaf Khān and 200 others to Āgra.*

فرمودم که فرزند پرویز ...... با آصف خان و جمعی که بدونسبت خدمت نزدیک داشتہ باشند متوجہ آگرہ گردند

T. J. 33, *l.* 5.

"I had issued orders to my son Parwīz ...... to proceed to Āgra with Āṣaf Khān and a body of those who were in close personal attendance on himself." بدونسبت appears to have been misread as بدویست 'with two hundred.'

VI. 305, *l.* 19. *There are many rivulets and fountains in Kashmīr, but Darah-lar .... is the best of all the streams.*

The real point of the remark has been missed. What Jahāngīr means is that the *water* of the river in the valley of Lār is the best, most potable, wholesome or digestible of all the waters found in the fountains and rivers of Kashmīr. He has just said that the water of the Behat is so 'dirty' that nobody drinks it.

در کشمیر آب رود خانہ و چشمہ بسیار است غایتاً بہترین آنہا آب درہ لار است

T. J. 45, *l.* 10 from foot.

"In Kashmīr there is plenty of drinking water in the rivers and springs. But the water of the valley of Lār is better than all of them."

The meaning of the passage is made quite clear by what Jahāngīr states elsewhere. He informs us that he had the water of the Ganges and that of the river of the valley of Lār [the Sind] weighed and found the former only ½ *māsha* lighter (T. J. 247, *l.* 12 from foot; tr. II. 238). The water of the Ganges was believed to be the lightest and purest in all India. Akbar drank it only and had it brought, from great distances in sealed jars (*Āīn*. tr. I. reprint 58). See also Foster, E. T. I. 226, 299 and note.

VI. 305, *l*, 9 from foot. *The surface of the land is so covered with green that it requires no carpet to be spread on it.*

بنوعي كہ فرش برىالاى آن انداختن بيدردي و كم سليقگى است

T. J. 45, *l.* 5 from foot.

"So that to spread a carpet on it would indicate want of feeling [indifference or blindness to the beauties of nature] and lack of good taste."

In other words, it would have been a "shame and a pity to spread a carpet, as that would only hide its natural loveliness". Akbar is said to have forbidden his courtiers to wear shoes and ordered them to walk barefoot, when his tents were pitched on a similar green sward near Ajodhan (Ṭ. A. B. I. text II. 231, *l.* 10; lith. 290, *l.* 10).

VI. 307, *l.* 16. *The fort of Rohtās ...... is constructed among the ravines, where it was scarcely conceivable that so strong a position could have been obtained.*

This is not very elegantly or even lucidly expressed. The meaning is that the fort was erected in such broken [or rugged] terrain, that any spot of the same (or greater) strength [*i. e.* so fitted by nature for a stronghold] could not be conceived of. The natural strength of the place was *inconceivably* great on account of its ruggedness.

و اين قلعہ را در شكستگى زمين بنا نهاده كہ بان استحكام جائى خيال نتوان كرد

T. J. 36, *l.* 5 from foot.

It is hardly correct to assert that the idea of obtaining a 'strong position' among 'ravines' is 'scarcely conceivable'. On the contrary, 'a strong position' can be very easily found among 'ravines' and its strength is, in fact, due to the 'ravines'.

VI. 309, *l.* 9. *In consequence of the annoyances I experienced, I found it a very troublesome march.*

ارابها بواسطۂ نا خوشي راه بمشقت تمام بمنزل رسيدند

T. J. 47, *l.* 13 from foot.

"The carts reached the camping or halting ground with the greatest difficulty on account of the badness of the roads." There is no reference in the original to any 'annoyance' or vexation experienced by Jahāngīr himself.

VI. 309, *l.* 10. *In this place, most of the sorrel brought from Kābul was injured.*

The word in the text, 'Rīwāj' points to 'Rhubarb', and not to sorrel, در همين جا ريواج از كابل آورده بودند ضايع شده بود

T. J. 47, l. 12 from foot.

Rîbâs, *Rivâs* or *Rîwâj* is described in the Persian pharmacopea, called *Makhzan-al-adwîya* as "A shrub two or three feet high, in appearance like beet (*salq*). In the middle are one or two stems of little thickness, the leaves are like those of a lettuce, but towards the root, of a violet or whitish colour. The heart is white, delicate, juicy, acidulous and slightly astringent......... The root is called *râwand* (rhubarb) .... It grows where snow lies and in mountainous countries. The best grows in Persia. It is medicinally attenuating and astringent, gives tone to the stomach and strengthens the appetite." Capt. Conolly [Journey to the North of India overland from England (1834), I. 213 note] speaks highly of the *rîwâj* of Nîshāpūr. Mr. Erskine states that it is "described as somewhat like beet-root, but much larger, red and white in colour, with large leaves that rise little from the ground. It is a pleasant mixture of sweet and acid. It may be the rhubarb, *râwand*" (Memoirs of Baber, 138 note).

Sorrel and rhubarb both belong to the same natural order, *Polygonaceae*, but the leaves of the former are edible, while those of the latter are poisonous. Sorrel leaves are eaten as salad or cooked as a puree. The thick, fleshy acid stalks of the rhubarb are stewed, made into tarts or used as preserves. The roots are medicinal and purgative.

VI. 310, *l*. 8 from foot. *'The life of fools is held very cheap in troublous times.'*

T. J. 48, *l*. 7. جان جاهل سختی ارزانی

Mr. Beveridge says that Mr. Alexander Rogers took this popular saying to mean that 'the soul of the fool can be purchased for little', while William Erskine paraphrased it as 'To serve a fool is hard indeed' (T. J. trans. I. 99 note).

جان seems to me to mean 'life', 'bodily or physical existence' and not 'soul'. بسختی is *perhaps* used here in the idiomatic sense of 'very', 'exceedingly', and not 'hard' or 'difficult'. What Jahângîr means is that these stupid brawlers were perpetually throwing away their own and their enemies' lives in their paltry squabbles and that all his efforts to bring home to them the folly of fighting for trifles had proved futile. He then cites the saying: "Fools hold life very cheap" or "To throw away life or hold it cheap is the mark of the fool".

Among the sayings or table-talk of Akbar recorded in the *Âîn*. is one in condemnation of the practice of 'Suttee'. It is worded thus;

میفرمودند زنان هندوستان جان بی بها را بیش ارز ساختم اند

Text I. 243, *l*. 12.

His Majesty said, "The women have made life which is of inestimable value exceedingly cheap (lit. valueless)." This is only another form of the maxim alluded to by Jahāngīr. سخت is often used by Baihaqī for 'very'.

مدتي سخت دراز 31, *l.* 5 from foot; 52, *l.* 11.

سخت نيكوكردي 172, *l.* 1; سخت صواب 192, *l.* 8 from foot.

But بسختى may mean 'in hardship, in adverse conditions of existence'. The meaning may be that "life is cheap in a sterile, inhospitable region like the Salt Range, where the struggle for existence is very severe".

VI. 311, *l.* 3 from foot. *On the 15th, I encamped at Amardī ...... On Monday, the 17th, I encamped near the fort of Attah ...... after making one march intermediately.*

Mr. Beveridge notes that the MSS have 'Amrohī' (tr. I. 100 note) and the *Maāṣiru-l-Umarā* reading is 'Ahrūī' (II. 755). I understand from a local official that there *is* a place called 'Harūī' about ten miles west of Ḥasan Abdāl. It lies between the railway stations of Burhān and Lawrencepur. There is now a bridge at Harūī and the Grand Trunk Road also passes over the bridge. Burhān is seven and Lawrencepur twelve miles distant from Ḥasan Abdāl by the North-Western Railway.

VI. 313, *l.* 2 from foot. *They report that His Majesty Humāyūn hunted wolves in these parts, and I have heard my father say, that he had himself attended his father two or three times on these hunts.*

The word in the text looks like گرگ (49, *l.* 17), but Mr. Rogers reads كرگ 'rhinoceros', and this is almost certainly right. The following passage from Major Bellew's 'Races of Afghanistan' may serve to reinforce that conclusion. "The Emperor (Bābur) in his quaint and valuable Memoirs ...... mentions having hunted the rhinoceros at the mouth of the Khyber and in the Bazar marsh ...... and also the tiger, in what is now the Attock ferry across the Indus. Both the tiger and the rhinoceros have long since disappeared from this country, but it would appear that the latter was in former times a very common animal in the Bazar marshes, for an adjacent pass and valley bear the name of Ambela ...... which is the antique Persian word for rhinoceros" (*op. cit.* p. 74). The passage referred to by Major Bellew may be

found in the *Bâbarnâma*, tr. 450.1; Erskine, Memoirs, tr. 292. The emperor states that on the 10th of December 1525 A. D., he halted near Begrām [Peshāwar] and went out to hunt rhinoceros after crossing the Siyāh-āb. "Humāyūn and those who came with him from that side [Tramontana], who had never seen a rhinoceros before were much entertained." He speaks of having killed three after a chase of two miles. Humāyūn was at Begrām and Peshāwar in 960–961 H. (Ṭ. A. lith. 219, *l.* 12; 220, *l.* 1; B. I. text II. 79–80; E. D. V. 235, 237). Akbar was with him at the time.

VI. 315, *l.* 7 from foot. *One of the conspirators hastily came to Khwāja Kuraishī.*

یکی ازآن جماعت سر باز زده خودرا بخواجه ویسی دیوان فرزند خرم میرسانند

T. J. 58, *l.* 11 from foot.

"A member of the group turning away his head from them (disagreeing with or having quarrelled with them) came to Khwāja Waisī."

As Mr. Rogers's rendering is different from mine and he speaks of a member of the band having gone "at the risk of his life" to Khwāja Waisī (tr. I. 122), it may be permissible to cite here the interpretation put upon the words by Mu'tamid Khān—a much higher authority. He writes that

تفاقاً یکی از آنها بتقریبی از رفقای خویش رنجیده

I. N. 28, *l.* 7 from foot.

"It so happened that one of them was for some reason offended with his associates." The *Maāṣiru-l-Umarā* also states that one of the conspirators got offended with the others از رفقا بیقربی کبیده (I. 93, *l.* 12). See also Blochmann, *Âin.* tr. I. 433. Abū-l-Faẓl states that Tāj Khān Jālori had twisted his head away from obedience. سرباز زده (A. N. III. 189; tr. III. 266). سرباز زدن is synonymous with سربرتافتن and سرپیچیدن

A. N. III. 483, trans. 729. ازسرکردن برانغار وجرانغار سرباز زدند
Khwāfī Khān, II. 571, *l.* 10. یوسف خان از سپردن قلعه سر وازده
Ibid. II. 751, *l.* 8 from foot. از اطاعت امیرالامرا سروازده
H. Ṣ. II. iv. 85. *l.* 5. نفست از قبول آن و صلت سرباز زده

VI. 316, *l.* 7. *Fathullā Khān was placed in prison.*

Delete 'Khān'. He was not one (text 58, *l.* 10 from foot; 59, *ll.* 1, 3). Mu'tamid Khān calls him 'Ḥakīm Fatḥullāh' (I. N. 28, *l.* 4;

30, *l.* 3). Just twelve lines higher up on p. 315, he is spoken of as "Fatḥullāh, son of Ḥakīm Abū-l-Fatḥ." See also Blochmann, *Āīn.* tr. I. reprint 469.

VI. 316, *l.* 7 from foot. *On Saturday, the 5th of the month, ... I set out towards the city. As I went, I distributed about 5000 rupees to the beggars, who lined both sides of the road along the whole way.*

موازي پنجهزار روپیہ از ریزگی از دودست پاشیده بدولت
سراي همایون......داخل گردیدم

T. J. 66, *l.* 17.

"I scattered with both hands about five thousand rupees worth of small coins and entered the auspicious palace."

ریزگی or زر ریزگی means fractional silver currency, the four-anna, two-anna and one-anna pieces which were used as *Niṣār*, and distributed as largesse on festivals, marriages and other ceremonial occasions or court functions. Jahāngīr says elsewhere that when he paid a visit to the tomb of Akbar, he scattered on the way five thousand rupees of *zar-i-rīzagī*.

در رفتن پنج هزار روپیہ زر ریزگي افشانده شد

T. J. 121, *l.* 5 from foot.

See also my Historical Studies in Mughal Numismatics, 179–80.

VI. 318, *l.* 7. *Khān Khānān, who was my preceptor, came from Burhānpūr.*

He *had been* Jahāngīr's '*Atālīq*' (lit. 'little father'), guardian, protector, adviser, 25 years before this date. The appointment had been made in the 27th year of Akbar's reign (990 H.), when prince Salīm was about fourteen years old (A. N. III. text 384, tr. 583; Muḥammad Hādī : *Dibācha* to *T. J.* p. 5, *l.* 12; Blochmann; *Āīn.* tr. I. 334).

VI. 319, *l.* 10 from foot. *My intention was, that it [scil. Akbar's mausoleum] should be so exquisite that the travellers of the world could not say they had seen one like it in any part of the inhabited earth.*

چرا که منظور آن بود که رونده های عالم مثل این عمارت در معموره
دنیا نشان ندهند

T. J. 72, *l.* 8 from foot.

This is a very common, if not hackneyed, expression for describing something which has not its equal or parallel in the world. Jahāngīr uses the very same words in connection with some buildings of his own at Vernāg in Kashmīr.

جائی مرتب شده کہ رونده های ربع مسکون مثل آن کم نشان می دهند

T. J. 45, *l.* 6; tr. I. 92; E. D. VI. 304.

We read in still another place of a building which he ordered to be erected in the valley of Ḥāfiz Jamāl near Ajmer.

جائي و مقامی ترتیب یافت کہ رونده هاي عالم مثل آن جائی نشان نمی دهند

Ibid. 132, *l.* 6; tr. I. 269.

Mr. Beveridge appends a note suggesting that Jahāngīr is probably alluding to the English ambassador, Sir Thomas Roe, or to some 'complementary remark' made by him (tr. I. 269). But the English ambassador arrived in India only in 1615 A. D. and all these passages were written before Jahāngīr had heard the name of Roe or dreamt of the existence of any such "traveller of the world". The first of the three passages arrests attention in the diary of his third regnal year (1607), the second of the second (1606) and the third of the ninth (1614).

Indeed, Budāūnī uses a very similar expression in praise of the great mosque at Fathpur-Sikri and describes it as

مسجدي رفيع و وسيع کہ مثل او در ربع مسکون کم نشان میدهند

II. 109, *l.* 5; tr. II. 112.

VI. 320, *l.* 18 *Mukarrib Khān sent me a picture, stating that the Portuguese believed it to be the portrait of Tīmūr.*

Mr. Beveridge asks if the picture mentioned "can be the original of that prefixed to White and Davey's translation of the Institutes" (tr. I. 154 note). He would have found a decisive answer in the negative if he had read the introduction to that work. It is clearly stated there (pp. XXV–XXVIII) that the frontispiece was taken from an album containing 198 portraits of "Tamerlane and the Great Mogals, his successors upto Aurangzeb as also of several Indian Rājās." This album had been presented by the poet, Alexander Pope, to the Bodleian Library in 1717 A. D. Pope had obtained it from John Cleland, who had purchased it from James Fraser (the historian of Nādir Shāh), who had got it as a gift from Tegh Beg Khān, the governor of Sūrat.

Another portrait of the conqueror is prefixed to Mr. Sandar's translation of Ibn 'Arabshāh's vitriolic diatribe on that scourge of Asia. It is a reproduction of an illustration in an old copy of the *Ẓafarnāma* of Yazdi. Another picture was recently sold at Sotheby's in London. "It shows Tamerlane celebrating a victory in the presence of generals, courtiers, musicians and attendants. It is one of the few authenticated drawings of Bihzād, whose gifted touch has assured

individuality to each figure. It is in ink on fine cloth, slightly coloured, and is said to have been part of the treasures taken to India by Babur" (Illustrated Weekly of India, 26th October 1941).

Jahāngīr himself speaks of Khān-i-'Ālam having brought from Persia, another large picture containing 240 portraits of Tīmūr and his sons and Amīrs who were present at the battle between himself and Tuqtamish Khān. It was the work of Khalīl Mirzā, a painter who had flourished in the reign of Mirzā Shāhrukh (T. J. 285, *l.* 11; tr. II. 116). The "Christian who was then the governor of Istambol" must have been the Byzantine emperor of the day—Manuel II (Paleologus) who reigned from 1391 to 1425 A. D. Ilderini Bāyazīd "was captured by the victorious arms" of Tīmūr in 1402 A. D. Manuel II was a weak and poor-spirited creature. His empire was an empire only in name, and as he was dreadfully afraid of an invasion of his own kingdom by the conqueror, he may have sent an embassy "with offers of submission" (C. W. Oman, The Byzantine Empire, pp. 335-336).

VI. 321, *l.* 7 from foot. ***As his eyes had been branded in days gone by, he told those people that while he was in prison hot cups had been tied over his eyes, which had left that mark.***

و اطراف چشم خود را کہ وقتی از اوقات داغ کردہ بود

T. J. 84, *l.* 2.

The words داغ کردہ بود imply, if they do not literally mean, that he had himself branded his eyes and that it was a deliberate dodge to lend colour to the imposture or false personation. The 'tying of the cups' must have been his own work and the marks round his eyes were due to the scars or cicatrices left after the process.

This story of red hot cupping glasses is not likely to have been put into circulation by this impostor, if he had not been sure that the blinding of Khusrav was a matter of common knowledge and universal belief. Khākī Shīrāzī has something new to tell us about this matter. He has left it on record that after the discovery of the plot to assassinate Jahāngīr, all the principal conspirators except Fathullāh, were put to death at Surkhāb on 1st Rajjab 1016 H. and that he and Khusrav were, when Jahāngīr was marching from Lāhore to Āgra, taken to Govindwāl (the site of the battle) and blinded *there* on 18th Shawwāl 1016 H. (Mullā Firūz Library, MS. folio 219 b, *l.* 7 from foot).

VI. 322, *l.* 3. ***Then ...... getting out of a window on the river side, they procured a boat.***

The word for 'window' in the text is کهرکی (84, *l.* 10) which really means 'postern' or 'wicket'. The I. N. speaks of دریچه که بطرف دریا بود (43, *l.* 9) a small gate on the side of the river. Jahāngīr says elsewhere that the fort of Āgra contained four gates (دروازه) and two *wickets* (دریچه). T. J. 2, *l.* 9.

VI. 322, *l.* 4 from foot. *I then ordered that .... they should be dressed in sordid garments and be paraded round the city.*

معجر پوشانیده (84, *l.* 5 from foot) means 'wearing women's veils'. The I. N. has exactly the same words (44, *l.* 10). Richardson's definition of معجر is 'a female headdress', 'a woman's veil reaching from her head to her middle.' Hawkins who witnessed the punishment says that "they were commanded to be shaven and to wear woman's apparel riding upon asses with their faces backwards." (Foster, Early Travels in India, 113).

VI. 323, *l.* 6. *He [Khān Khānān] had been sent on service to the Dakhin for a certain time.*

چرا که قبل ازین خط تعهد بخدمت صوبه دکهن بمدتی معین سپرده
در ملازمت سلطان پرویز ...... بدان مهم عظیم متوجه گشته بود

T. J. 86, *l.* 12.

"Because, some time before this, he had given an undertaking in writing to perform the duty of conquering the *Ṣūba* of the Dakhin within a certain fixed period." The meaning is that he had, when appointed commander-in-chief of the Dekkan, bound himself to conquer the entire territory within a certain specified period. He had now failed to do so, although all the forces and supplies demanded by him as necessary for the performance of the task had been placed at his disposal. All doubts as to the real meaning of the passage are dissolved on reference to a preceding page (318), where Jahāngīr observes that "Khān Khānān having undertaken to suppress all the disturbances which had arisen in the territory of Niẓāmu-l-Mulk at the death of the late emperor, wrote ***a document, in which he engaged*** that if he did not successfully perform this service within two years, he would confess himself liable to punishment provided only that, besides the army which was already in the province, a force of 12000 horse and a treasure of ten *lacs* of rupees be placed at his disposal." (Text 71, *l.* 11; cf. R. and B.'s tr. I. 149).

Mu'tamid Khān also writes thus :

قبل ازین خط تعهد فتح دکن بمدت معین سپرده بود

I. N. 44, *l*. 5 from foot. See also *Ibid*. 34, *l*. 5 from foot.

"Some time before this, he had given a written undertaking to conquer the Dekkan within a stated period."

Mr. Rogers says, "a letter of appointment to the service of the Deccan had been given to him" (tr. I. 178), but this misses the real point—the gravamen of his offence. It was he who had given a written undertaking to conquer the Deccan خط تعهد فتح دکن and he had failed to perform the task. Similarly, when Dilāwar Khān was appointed Governor of Kashmīr, he had given a promise in writing that in the course of two years he would conquer Tibet and Kishtwār."

خط تعهد سپرده که در عرض دو سال فتح تبت و کشتوار نماید

T. J. 225, *l*. 7 from foot; trans. II. 6.

VI. 324, *l*. 8 from foot. *The fourth bears a heavy stone.*

The text also (97, *l*. 2 from foot) has سنگ درشتی 'a hard or rough stone', but Mr. Beveridge prefers the variant سنگ و رسنی 'a stone and a cord' (sling), which is found in MSS. (tr. I. 200 note). As the *Iqbālnāma*, which contains a description of this miniature engraving also has سنگ و رسنی in the counterpart pssage (B. I. text 57, *l*. 3 from foot), the emendation seems worthy of acceptance. Mughal miniature painting had reached its highest point about this time. Bernier was greatly struck by the Liliputian artistry on a shield which depicted the exploits of Akbar (Travels, Edit. Constable 254).

VI. 326, *l*. 5. *When they presented a horse or elephant to any man, ... they were not to require obeisance from him with a horse's bridle or an elephant's goad placed upon his back.*

This curious rule of court-etiquette is mentioned by Faiẓī. When he was sent to Rājā 'Alī Khān of Khāndesh, he took with him a sword, a dress of honour and several horses as tokens of imperial condescension and favour. He writes that "Rājā 'Alī went and stood respectfully in his place at the edge of the carpet opposite the throne. The royal horses were there. He kissed the reins, *placed them on his shoulder* and saluted them" (*Wāqi'āt*, in E. D. VI. 149).

VI. 326, *l*. 6 from foot. *The breadth [of the province of Bengal] from the northern mountain to the province of Madāran (Midnāpūr) is 220 kos.*

The gloss in brackets is wrong. The 'province' or *sarkār* of Madāran, as it is called in the text, was very different from Midnāpūr. It was "a long straggling strip of territory running from Bīrbhūm in the north to the junction of the Hūglī and Rupanārāyaṇa rivers in the south" (Beames, J. R. A. S. 1896, p. 105). The town of Madāran or Bhītargarh-Madāran is situated midway between Burdwān and Midnāpūr. It is in Jahānābād, the north-western portion of Hūglī district" (Blochmann, J. A. S. B. 1872, p. 223 note). The form 'Midnāpūr' is the Anglo-Indian corruption of Medinīpur ('City of the army') as the name is written in Sanskrit and Mughal chronicles. The two towns also are about forty miles distant from each other and are quite distinct. Niẓāmu-d-dīn Aḥmad explicitly says in his account of the campaign in Bengal, that Todar Mal returned from Medinīpūr [Midnāpūr] to Madāran (Ṭ. A. B. I. text II. 304, *l.* 6; E. D. V. 385).

VI. 326, *l.* 3 from foot. [*The governors of Bengal*] ***maintained .... 400 or 500 war boats.***

Correctly, 4000 or 5000 as in the text (101, *l.* 9), and also in the *Āīn*. tr. II. 129, from which the whole description of the *Ṣūba* has been borrowed. Compare also *Khulāṣatu-t-tawārīkh*, (text 49, *l.* 4; tr. in I. A. 46), where the number of boats کشتی is given as 4400. The *Iqbālnāma* has چهار پنج هزار از نواره جنگی 'four or five thousand boats fit to be used in naval warfare' (*i. e.* war-galleys) in the counterpart passage (text 60, *l.* 11).

VI. 328, *l.* 10 from foot. *The battle began and the fight waxed warm.*

Dowson has left out the date of this decisive engagement, though it is given in the text. It was Sunday, 9th Muḥarram, 1021 H. (102, *l.* 11 from foot). The book-rule date corresponded with Monday, 2nd March 1612 O. S. according to the Indian Ephemeris. If the week-day is correctly stated, it should be 1st March.

The site of the battle has not been determined. The *Makhzan-i-Afghānī* speaks of the place as 'Nek Ujyāl', about one hundred *kos* from Dāccā. But this really "gets us no forrarder" as there are several villages called Ujyāl in Eastern Bengal (*Āīn*. tr. I. 520).

VI. 331, *l.* 13. ***The Emperor Bābar has in his Memoirs given an able description and pictured representation of several animals; but it is most probable he never ordered the painters to draw them from the life.***

The words 'pictured representation' are liable to mislead the reader, especially as the clause which follows may be understood to mean that the 'drawings' were not 'drawings from the life', but from memory or imagination.

What Jahāngīr really says is

حضرت فردوس مکانی اگرچہ درواقعات خود صورت و اشکال بعضی جانوران را نوشتہ اند غایتاً بمصوران نفرمودہ اند کہ صورت آنہارا تصویر نمایند

T. J. 105, *l.* 10.

Although H. M. the Emperor Bābur has, in his Memoirs, described in words (lit. written) the general appearance (or features) and shapes of several animals, he does not, in any case [غایتاً] appear to have given orders [to the painters] to draw pictures of any of them [from the life].

VI. 332, *l.* 10. *A handsome ornamented inkstand and pen were this day given by 'Itimādu-d-daula.*

These articles were not given or presented *by* I'timādu-d-daula, but *to* him by Jahāngīr.

باعتمادالدولہ دوآت و قلم مرصع عنایت شد

T. J. 106, *l.* 8 from foot.

He was now appointed Wazīr and these writing materials were the symbols of that office. Blochmann observes that "it was customary under the Mughal Government to confer a pen-box or golden inkstand or both, as insignia of *Dīwāns*. When such officers were deposed, they generally returned the presents." *Āīn.* tr. I. (reprint), 453 note.

When Ja'far Khān was appointed *Wazīr* by Aurangzeb, he also was given an enamelled pen-case.

بعطاي خلعت وزارت وقلمدان مرصع سرافرازی یافت

Kh. Kh. II. 177, *l.* 5.

Kām Bakhsh bestowed the قلمدان وزارت upon his favourite Ḥakīm Muḥsin when he assumed the imperial title (*Ibid.* II. 569 last line). Dowson's rendering of قلمدان there is 'portfolio' (E. D. VII. 390). Niẓāmu-l-Mulk Āṣaf Jāh also received "an ornamental pen-case" along with other presents when he was appointed Wazīr of the Empire (E. D. VII. 518; Khwāfī Khān text II, 939-940). See also M. U. II. 730, *l.* 14.

VI. 333, *l.* 12 from foot. ***Acting upon this view, he* [*'Abdullāh Khān*] *paid no heed to Rājā Mān Singh, when the latter wished to settle a concerted plan.***

In the text, the name is given as 'Rājā Rām Dās.,

هر چند رامداس خواست که با و قرار دهد که بتانی و آهستگی
پیش میرفته باشد فایده نکرد

T. J. 107, *l.* 13 from foot.

"Howmuchsoever Rāmdās tried to get him to advance slowly and deliberately, it was of no avail." See also I. N. 65, *l.* 5. Jahāngīr in recording the appointment earlier in the chronicle of the 6th year liary states that he appointed Rāmdās Kachhwāh to the Dekkan with the deliberate intention that he would keep a watch upon 'Abdullāh Khān's proceedings and prevent him from making an untimely display of reckless and precipitate courage.

خبردار احوال او باشد و نگذارد که ازو تهور و شتاب زدگی
بیوقت بفعل آید

T. J. 98, *l.* 14. See also tr. I. 202.

VI. 334 *l.* 15. *So it* [*the Mughal army*] ***retreated and joined the camp*** *of Prince Parwīz near Burhānpūr.*

در عادل آباد که حوالی برهان پور واقع است باردوی
پرویز ملحق شدند

T. J. 108, *l.* 9.

"They joined the camp of Parwīz at 'Ādilābād, which is within the limits of Burhānpūr." See also I. N. 66, *l.* 11. 'Ādilābād is 'Edlābād' in Khāndesh. Constable, 31 Da.

VI. 336, *l.* 3. *After a siege of four months and ten days, he* [*Akbar*] *overpowered the men of Amarsingh's father, took the fortress* [*of Chitor*] *and returned.*

There is an oversight here. Rānā Udayasiṁha, in whose reign, (*r.* 1541–1572 A. D.) Chitor was besieged, was the grandfather, and not the father, of Amarasiṁha, who was the son of Pratāpasiṁha (*r.* 1572–1598 A. D.), the son of Udayasiṁha (Tod. A. A. R. Ed. Crooke, Book IV. Chs. 10–12).

VI. 337, *l.* 8. ***Rājā Bāsu died at Shāhābād, on the Rānā's frontier.***

This must be Shāhābād which is now in Jhālāwār state. Constable, Pl. 27 Cc. It lies about ninety miles north of Sironj and the same distance southwest of Gwālior. It is sometimes called 'Shāhābād-Dhamdhera', to distinguish it from other places of the same name. Lat. 25°–13′ N., Long. 77°–12′ E. (Thornton).

VI. 338, *l.* 5. ***I wrote him* [*Khān A'ẓam*] *a very kind letter, but my words had no effect upon him.***

No letter was written. A long verbal message was sent with a confidential servant, named Ibrāhīm Ḥusain. Its purport occupies about 15 lines in the T. J. 126, *ll.* 9–23.

چون این مقدمہ مسموع گشت ابراهیم حسین را کہ از خدمتگاران
معتمد حضور بود همراه او فرستادم و سخنان لطف آمیز مهرانگیز
بدو پیغام کردم

T. J. 126, *l.* 9.

See also R. and B.'s tr. I. 257; I. N. 72–3.

Jahāngīr afterwards writes in *l.* 22 of the same page.

ابراهیم حسین رفت و این سخنان را بهمین تفصیل خاطر نشین او ساخت

"Ibrāhīm Ḥusain went and impressed these words firmly into his mind" (but without effect).

VI. 339, *l.* 2 from foot. *I also wrote a kind letter to the Rānā's son, desiring him to specify the way in which he would come to pay his respects.*

The letter was not written to the Rāṇā's son, but to his own prince Khurram.

و فرمان مرحمت عنوان بان فرزند نوشتم کہ اگر نوعي نماید کہ این
مقدمہ بوقوع آید این خدمت عمده رز دلخواه
ما کرده خواهد بود

T. J. 134, *l.* 16.

"And I wrote to that son [of mine] a gracious *farmān* (saying) that if he could manage affairs in such a way that these preliminary (successes) would be translated into fact, he would do a valuable service which would be in complete accord with my heartfelt wishes."

VI. 340, *l.* 8. *The second happy tidings was the death of Bahādur, son of the Chief of Gujarāt, and the leaven of insubordination and turbulence.*

As this is both vague and obscure, it may be necessary to state that he was the son of Muẓaffar III, the last Sulṭān of Gujarāt and had been a thorn in the side of local governors ever since his father had sought and found deliverance from shame and ignominy by cutting his throat with a razor in 1001 A. H. (Commissariat: History of Gujarat, p. 528). The Mughal chroniclers are discreetly reticent about him, but William Finch records the fact of his having sacked and held Cambay for fourteen days in 1606 A. D. (E. T. I. 133 and 173). and Hawkins speaks of him as "one of the three arch enemies which, with all his [Jahāngīr's] forces, cannot be called in" (*Ibid.* 100). De Laet states that "he is strong enough to defy all the forces of the King of the Mogols" (tr. Hoyland, 28; See also *Ibid.* p. 20).

Jahāngīr himself mentions him in the *Tūzuk* in the diary of the first year, in which it is stated that a son of that Muẓaffar Gujarātī who claimed to be descended from the rulers of that country lifted up the head of disturbance and attacked and plundered the environs of the city of Aḥmadabad (R. and B.'s tr. I. 49, text 23, *l*. 11).

Abū-l-Faẓl records the suppression of an earlier revolt in the 42nd year of Akbar's reign (1005 H. = 1597 A. D.). Bahādur had, after his fathar's death, "taken shelter with Tiwārī"—in the kingdom of Rājpīpla and plundered the town of Dhandhūka, but was routed and put to flight by the local troops under the leadership of Rājā Sūraj Singh Rāṭhor (A. N. III. 725; tr. III. 1083).

VI. 341, *l*. 3. *When the Rānā advanced to kiss the Prince's feet and beg pardon for his offence the Prince raised him up.*

وقتی کہ رانا پای آن فرزند را گرفتہ عذر تقصیرات خود میخواست

T. J. 135, *l*. 8.

"When the Rāṇā *clasped* the feet of my son and begged pardon for his offences."

Dr. Benī Prasād indignantly refuses to believe Jahāngīr's assertion about the Rāṇā having 'kissed' or even 'clasped' Prince Khurram's feet. He avers that it must be false, because "clasping the feet was not recognised as a mode of paying respects to kings or princes among the Mughals or Rajputs" and because "it is not supported by other authorities." But "embracing the feet" of parents, uncles, aunts and other older relatives, as well as patrons and benefactors, is a very old Hindu custom and is frequently referred to in the *Kathāsaritsāgara*. A female monkey who is fettered by a mass of creepers which had twisted round and entangled her is set at liberty by the Brāhmana Chandrasvāmin, who climbs the tree and cuts down the creepers with his axe. The female monkey and her mate come down also and embrace his feet (Book XVIII, Chap. 123; tr. Tawney, II. 596, Edit. Penzer, IX. 47).

In another story, a woman on being told by the Brāhmaṇa Yajñasvāmin that he was her mother's brother, and recognising him, embraces his feet weeping (Book XVIII, Chap. 123; tr. Tawney, II. 606). In the *Rāmāyaṇa*, Rāma on meeting his mothers and the sage Vasishtha in the forest, "clasps" or "presses" their feet in salutation and Sītā pays reverence in the same way to her mothers-in-law (*Ayodhyākāṇḍa*, tr. Griffith, Book II, Canto CIV; reprint, 1915, p. 213, col. 2).

In the *Kādambarī* of Bāṇa, Hārīta Ṛishi embraces the feet of his father, the saint Jabāli, when he meets him (Trans. Ridding, 43).

In the *Chhatra Prakāsha* of Lallu Lāl Kavi also, it is stated that when Kīrtisiṅgha, the son of Rājā Jagatrāja was dying about 1757 A. D. and his father went to see him, "the son extended his hand to touch his feet." Pogson, the translator, explains in a note that this is "a usual mark of respect from children to their parents. It is also a humble mode of saluting the aged, the pious and any superior" (History of the Boondelas, Edit. 1828, p. 108 and note).

VI. 341, *l.* 14. *The New Year's day of my tenth year corresponded with the 8th Safar 1024 H.*

The 'Alīgarh text also reads هشتم (137, *l.* 9).

Dowson remarks that it should be 18th = 10th March, 1615 A. D. and Mr. Beveridge accepts the correction (I. 280 note). But Jahāngīr gives the weekday as شنبه Saturday, and Saturday, 11th March 1615 A. D. synchronised with 20th Ṣafar 1024 H. (Ind. Eph.). هشتم must be therefore an example of the oft-recurring confusion of this word with بیستم in Persian writing. The ninth *Julūs* year is said to have commenced on the 9th of Ṣafar and the eleventh on the 1st of Rabī'u-l-awwal by Dowson himself at pp. 338 and 346. There is usually a difference of *eleven* days year after year.

VI. 341, *l.* 3 from foot. *Up to my fourteenth year, I had never drunk wine, except two or three times in childhood.*

The printed text has تا سن پانزده سالگی (151, *l.* 3) 'upto my *fifteenth* year' and Mr. Beveridge points out that three good manuscripts agree in reading هژدهم eighteenth. This reading is in *partial* conformity with the incidental details given by Jahāngīr below. We are told that Akbar was then "in the field against the Yūsufzāī Afghān and was encamped near Atak on the Nīlāb."

Now Abū-l-Faẓl has left it on record that the emperor arrived at Atak on 12th Dai of the XXXth regnal year (*A. N.* III. 476; tr. III. 717). Niẓāmu-d-dīn Aḥmad gives the Hijra date as 15th (*recte* 11th ?) Muḥarram 995 H., instead of 994 H.; but this is because he has put the event into the XXXIst year, instead of into the XXXth (993–994) (Ṭ. A. 368, *l.* 13). Abū-l-Faẓl's date works out to 22nd or 23rd December 1585 A. D. As Jahāngīr was born on the 17th or the 18th Rabī' I. 977 H. = 31st August 1569 A. D., he must have been in his 17th year at the time. He had then completed sixteen years and less

than four months by the solar and sixteen years and about ten months by the lunar reckoning.

Mr. Beveridge is mistaken in asserting that he had completed the seventeenth and was running in his eighteenth year (tr. I. 307 note). Dr. Beṇī Prasād also is in error in following his lead and declaring that 'eighteenth' is "doubtless correct" (Jahāngīr 27 note). He had failed to notice that Mr. Beveridge is mistaken in calculating the interval between 31-8-1569 A. D. and December 1585 A. D. as *17* years and 4 months. It is only *sixteen* years, three months and some days. In an earlier reference to his bacchanalian habits Jahāngīr states that he had been accustomed to take wine from his eighteenth year (T. J. 4, *l.* 13; E. D. VI. 285; R. and B.'s tr. I. 8).

VI. 342, *l.* 5. *I one day went out hunting. I met with many mishaps.*

There were no mishaps or accidents.

چون تردد بسیار واقع شد و آثار ماندگي ظاهر گشت

T. J. 151, *l.* 9.

"As there was considerable physical exertion and the signs of exhaustion appeared."

Jahāngīr had been trudging on foot (or riding on horseback) and was tired and knocked up by a long day's trek. تردد means 'movement, exertion, going to and fro.' Dowson has misunderstood the word. Akbar is said to have walked for sixteen *kos* on foot in one day while shooting *gorkhar* (wild ass) near Ajodhan (Ṭ. A. B. I. text II. 2.0, *l.* 2 from foot; E. D. V. 336).

VI. 342, *l.* 14. *In the course of nine years, I got up to twenty cups of double-distilled spirit....... The weight of this was six sers of Hindustān, equal to one man of Īrān.*

This brutally candid and also somewhat boastful 'confession of a drunkard' has evoked from Mr. Moreland the following observations which appear to me to be founded on a misconception.

"If these *sers* are Akbarī, the daily ration of strong undiluted spirit was over eight lbs. Such spirit would weigh practically a pound the pint, so the ration would be more than a gallon. The doctors whom I have consulted agree that this is utterly impossible because alcoholic poisoning would have resulted immediately. If the unit is Hindustānī, the ration would be little over two pints, which I am informed, is within the limits of possibility" (Notes on Indian Maunds, Indian Antiquary, LXI. 1932, p. 7).

It will be seen that Mr. Moreland refuses to believe that Jahāngīr could have daily ingested twenty cups of this 'arrack' (عرق) and seeks to whittle down the *man* or *ser*, with a view to bring it "within the limits of possibility." But there is in the *Tūzuk* another passage in which Jahāngīr speaks of a man whose 'daily ration' of this "double-distilled spirit" was much larger than his own, and who died at fifty-seven, not from "alcoholic poisoning", but on account of injudicious and unduly prolonged abstinence from that 'poison'. The obituary notice in which the emperor deplores the demise from an unusual and unexpected cause of his fellow-toper is thus worded in Mr. Rogers' translation. "On the 29th (Ramazān 1016 H.) Shīr Khān, the Afghān, one of my old servants died. One may say he committed suicide (قصد خود کرد). He was continually drinking wine, to the extent that in every watch (پهر) he used to drink four brimming cups of arrack of double strength (عرق دو آتشه). He had broken (قضا *i. e.* not observed) the fast of the Ramazān of the past year, and took it into his head this year that he would fast in the month of Sha'bān (also), on account of his having broken (قضا) the fast of Ramazān, and would fast for two months together. In abandoning his usual custom, which is a second nature, he became weak and his appetite left him and becoming very weak, he passed away in his fifty-seventh year" (T. J. trans. I. 134–135; text 64, *l.* 10).

Here then is a thirsty soul who goes one better than Jahāngīr and who is stated to have gulped down, not twenty, but thirty-two cups of this same "arrack of double strength" for many years. His death at the age of fifty-seven, is declared to have been due not to his intemperate habits, or 'alcoholic poisoning', but to a fit of devotional zeal in which he inconsiderately departed for two months from that "habit" of boozing, which had become a second nature. What then are we to think and how are we to explain this much more staggering asseveration about "the four brimming cups swallowed in every watch", regularly and uninterruptedly for years? It seems to me that the question hinges more round the proportion of alcohol in the beverage, round the strength of this "double-distilled" liquor and not round its apparent quantity. We must first make sure of and *determine* that. Mr. Moreland's inferential reasoning is vitiated by the use of the ambiguous word 'spirit' and the supposition that there was a pound of 'pure undiluted spirit' to the pint, that is, 80 p. c. of alcohol in it. This supposition or assumption is utterly unwarranted and *unprovable*.

Factually, we know very little about this 'arrack'. It was distilled in different parts of India from a variety of substances, *e. g.* from dates, *Mhowa* flowers, rice, various species of palms yielding toddy, and also from sugarcane, *jaggree* (black sugar), molasses etc. [Hobson Jobson, *s. v.* Arrack; *Āīn* tr. I (reprint), 73–4 ; Bernier : Travels, Edit. Constable, p. 253]. Its strength also varied considerably as the process of distillation (q. v. *Āīn. l. c.*) was exceedingly crude and imperfect. It is possible to attach too much significance to the word *Doātasha* 'twice-fired', which is really nothing more than a synonym of 'Bevḍā', the name of the 'country liquor' of the Indian bazars. The strength of this *Bevḍā* has, for many years, been estimated as 25° under-proof, that is, 25% below that of proof-spirit. As proof-spirit contains only 49.3% of alcohol, the proportion of alcohol or pure spirit in the *Bevḍā* is 49.5 *minus* 25 or 24.3%. In other words, it is not even half as strong as whisky or brandy, which contain about 55% of alcohol. This *Bevḍā* becomes milder with age and we may be sure that what the prince Salīm imbibed was not the raw and heady beverage of the taverns but a mellowed and matured drink. It was of course stronger than the sweet and delicious Shīrāz and Kābul wines with which he had inaugurated his bacchanalian career. As they probably contained like the light French wines of Bordeaux and Burgandy, only about ten or twelve *per cent* of alcohol, this twice-fired 'arrack' containing about 25 *per cent* may have been doubly as strong. But in any case, there are good reasons for holding that its alcoholic content was not more than half of whisky or brandy. Two bottles of whisky—52 ounces—would contain about 28.6 ounces ($\frac{52}{1} \times \frac{55}{100}$) of alcohol. Eight pounds of *Bevḍā* or this 'double-fired arrack' would contain only 32 ($128 \times \frac{25}{100}$).

VI. 343, *l.* 3. ***I take it [wine] at night, except on Thursday, that being the day of my accession to the throne, and on Friday which is the most holy day in the week, for I do not think it right to pass these nights in headlessness.***

و شب جمعه که از شبهای متبرکه ایام هفته است و روز متبرک
در پیش دارد بملاحظه این دو چیز در آخرهای روز میخورم که
خوش نمی آید که این شب بغفلت گذرانیده در ادای شکر
منعم حقیقی تقصیر رود

T. J. 151, *l.* 4 from foot.

And on the night of Friday (our Thursday), I drink at the end of the day (*i. e.* before sunset, on our Thursday), out of regard for two

things, *viz*. that it is one of the blessed nights of the week and the prelude to a holy day. For these reasons, it is not pleasing to me that this night should be passed in (غفلت) unconsciousness, or that there should be any remissness in thanking the True Benefactor (for His favours)." The night should be devoted to prayer and a vigil observed, which would be impossible if the potations were to begin after sunset on our Thursday night. He means that on Thursday, he used to begin about noon and go on in the afternoon or upto sunset, contrary to the rule of not drinking during the day time which was observed on other days of the week.

VI. 343, *l.* 12. *I take eight surkhs of opium when five hours of the day have passed and six surkhs after one hour of the evening.*

The words in the text are پنج گہری از روز 'five *gharīs* not 'hours' after day-break', *i. e. two hours* after sunrise and بعد از یک پہر شب one *watch* (about three hours) after nightfall (T. J. 152, *l.* 4).

VI. 343. *l.* 7 from foot. *The Bargīs Jādū Rāi and Bābā Jūkayath came to see him.*

The second name is found written in many ways. A MS has 'Bābā Chokanth'. It is '*Mālūjī* Kāntīya' in the (*Maāṣiru-l-Umarā* II. 646. 'Bābū Kāntīya' in the T. J. text 153, *l.* 19 and Bābūjīv Kānth in the I. N. 84, *l.* 2 from foot). The surname is, most probably Kāṇṭe.

'Kāṭe', and the person referred to as Bābājī Kāṭe, who was *jāgīrdār* of Supā Bārāmatī in the Poona district appear to be identical. Jahāngīr speaks of his having been killed by the treachery of a friend in the diary of the 12th year (T. J. 197, *l.* 23; tr. I. 399). This identification receives some support from the fact that a dispute between Bābājī's sons Dharmojī and Sambhājī, in connection with the partition of their *watan*, was referred to by way of arbitration and amicably settled by Shāhajī Bhosle, the father of Shivājī (Kavi Paramānanda's *Shivabhārata*, *apud* Sardesai, *Marāṭhī Riyāsat*, I. i. 25, 27 note).

VI. 344, *l.* 15. *'Ambar fled from the field, and had it not been a very dark night, none of the enemy would have escaped.*

The battle was fought on Sunday, the 25th Bahman of the 10th regnal year, 1024-5 H. (T. J. 153, *l.* 5 from foot). This was Sunday, 4th February 1616 or 26th Ramaẓān 1025 H. = Māgh *Vadi* (or *Krishna paksha*) 12 V. S. 1673. The 12th of the dark fortnight would be, of course, without any moonlight worth speaking of.

VI. 347, *l*. 4 from foot. *About sunset, I reached my camp in the village of the Deo Rānā, a distance of nearly two kos (from Ajmer).*

The correct name is 'Deorāī' or 'Dorāī'. There is a village of this name about five miles south of Ajmer.

VI. 347, *l*. 2 from foot. *Is is customary in India, when a King ...... undertakes an expedition towards the east, to ride on an elephant with long tusks; when towards the west, to ride on a horse of one colour; when towards the north, to go in a litter or pālkī; when towards the south, to go in a carriage drawn by bullocks.*

This custom had its origin probably in the ancient Hindu classification of the four great rulers in the four quarters of India, as *Gajapati*, the Lord of elephants in the East; *Ashvapati*, Lord of horses in the West; *Narapati*, Lord of men (the *pālkī*-bearers were humans) in the North and Bhūpati, Lord of the earth (or soil which was ploughed by bullocks) in the South. See Huen-Tsiang, tr. Beal. I. 13 and notes.

The four 'angas' or 'limbs' of an ancient Hindū army also were elephants, horses, chariots and footmen. As the lord of each quarter was supposed to be specially strong in one of these arms, the invader of that quarter was to march from his capital mounted on that very arm.

This custom appears to have been introduced at the Mughal court by Akbar and was one of his Hinduising innovations. Abū-l-Faẓl records that when the emperor proceeded to the eastern provinces in 991 H.—1583 A. D., he "in accordance with the rules of the experienced men of India, went off on a lofty elephant" (A. N. III. 415; tr. 617). When Dārā Shikoh marched towards the south to encounter Aurangzeb and Murād Bakhsh, he got into a carriage (ملا) with a silver railing and was allowed by Shāh Jahān to march out of the palace with all his kettledrums playing ('*Amal-i-Ṣāliḥ* III. 289, *l*. 11).

VI. 350, *l*. 12 from foot. *It is said that as he had a very hot temper in the days of his youth, he always remained in water.*

چون در ایام حیات بواسطهٔ حرارتی که در طبیعت او غالب بود
همیشه در آب بسر میبرد

T. J. 181, *l*. 8 from foot.

"During the period in which he was alive, he had to pass his time in the midst of water on account of the overpowering (sensation of) heat in his physical constitution or body." Jahāngīr is probably

referring to some local tradition ascribing this to the injection, by Naṣīru-d-dīn, of one of those powerful aphrodisiacs or nervine tonics prepared out of gold, iron or copper, which are known as *Bhasma*, *Rasāyana* or *Mātrā* in Hindu medicine and as *Kushta* in the *Ūnānī* system. These crude metallic concoctions produce cutaneous eruptions, swellings and even purulent tumours. 'The historian of Rājasthān' complains that "these empyrics waste alike the purse and health of the ignorant by the sale of aphrodisiacs which are sought after with great avidity. Gums, metals, minerals, all are compounded, and for one preparation, while the author was at Udaipur, 7000 rupees (nearly £ 1000) were expended by the court-physician (A. A. R. Ed. Crooke, II. 759). Abū-l-Faẓl says that Burhān Niẓāmu-l-mulk "used mercurial medicines to increase his virility and made himself ill by listening to quacks, so that he became hopeless of life" (A. N. III. 668, *l.* 6; tr. III. 1024). Shāhbāz Khān Kanbū also was addicted to quicksilver (M. U. II. 598, *l.* 7) and died of it. Dowson's diagnosis of the Sulṭān's affection or idiosyncracy as moral or psychical, and not physical, is proved to be erroneous by what Jahāngīr himself states elsewhere in his description of Naṣīru-d-dīn's summer-palace at Kālīyāda. "He erected this building, in the middle of the river and dividing its water into canals, brought it outside as well as inside into reservoirs small and large, because the heat overcame him so much that he had to pass his time in water" (T. J. R. B.'s tr. I. 354, text 174 last line). The meaning is that he was obliged *in summer* to live in a 'Sardāba', an artificial grotto or water-palace. طبیعت means nature or constitution and حرارت طبیعی is 'natural heat' (Richardson).

VI. 354, *l.* 13 from foot. *In other parts, the customs officers take the tenth or twentieth part.*

Dowson reads *'Ushūrgas* and says it literally means 'tithingmen'. But the text reads the sentence thus:

در دیگر بنادر عشور گویان ده یک و هشت یک میگیرند

T. J. 206 last line.

"But in other parts, they take one tenth or one-eighth (*i. e.* ten or twelve and a half per cent [*ad valorem*], giving it the name of (lit. 'speaking of it as') *'ashūr'* ('Tithe', from عشر ten"). What Jahāngīr means is that عشور was a misnomer. Khwāfī Khān speaks of 'ashūr as عشور آنچه جنس مسقط ببندر سورت بالای جهازات میرود

"*Ushūr* or customs duties levied on the goods (exported) from Muscat to the port of Sūrat" (*Muntakhab*, text II. 285, *l*. 3 from foot; E. D. VII. 313). Elsewhere, the same author refers to the عشورجنس غلم having been remitted by Aurangzeb during a famine or drought (*Ibid*. II. 88, *l*. 11). Dowson's rendering is "the tithe of corn" VII. 247.

The text has هشت یک 'one-eighth'. Dowson has read the word as بیست یک 'one-twentieth', but this must be wrong as what Jahāngīr means is that they used to extort ten *per cent* and even a *higher* amount, *i. e*. twelve and a half *per cent*. It is 'one in *eight*' in the translation of R. and B. also (I. 417).

VI. 356, *l*. 14. *On Sunday night, the 23rd of Rabīu-l-awwal, A H. 1027 (10th March, 1618) at about two hours after sunset, [the Sun entered Aries].*

The text has 'Wednesday [چهارشنبه not یک شنبه] fourteen and a half *gharīs*' *i. e*. about *six* hours, after *sunrise* (T. J. 223, *l*. 3). This can be proved by calculation to be correct. Dowson himself states, only six lines lower down on this page, that the 2nd of Farwardīn was a Thursday. The I. N. also has چهارشنبه, though the date of the month is wrongly printed as سوم, instead of بیست وسوم Rabī' I as in the Bibl. Ind. edition, III. *l*. 13. Again, if the 21st of Farwardīn was a Tuesday as Jahāngīr notes in *l*. 6 from foot, the 1st *must* have been a Wednesday.

VI. 356, *l*. 3 from foot. *It occurred to me that I had better remain at Māndū during this hot season. As I had heard much praise of the rainy season of Gujarāt and as there was no comparison between the city of Ahmadābād and that of Māndū, I at last determined to remain in the former.*

There is no reference to or comparison with Māndū in the text.

بخاطرم گذشت کہ ایام تابستان درین موسم بدار الخلافت توجہ نفرمائیم
چون تعریف برشکال ملک گجرات بسیار شنیدہ و شہرت احمدآباد را
نسبتی ناندہ بود قصد گجرات بخیال گذشت و آخر راي ببودن
احمدآباد قرار گرفت

T. J. 226, *l*. 1.

"It occured to me that I should not march to the capital [Āgra] in this summer. As I had heard great praise of the rainy season of Gujarāt, and as Aḥmadābād was unquestionably (or incomparably) the

most famous [of all towns in Gujarāt], I thought of proceeding to Gujarāt and at last it was determined to stay in Aḥmadābād."

مانده seems to have been wrongly read as ماندو (Māndū) and the meaning of the other words turned and twisted so as to fit in with the error. cf. R. B. tr. II. 6; but there the rendering of شهرت احمدآباد را نسبتی نمانده بود is, "there was no report about the evil reputation of Aḥmadābād (see *infra* for account of epidemic there)".

VI. 357, *l.* 3 from foot. ***On Saturday, I had a severe headache.***

The text has Tuesday, 15th Khurdād and the fever is said to have abated on the 16th کم شنبه Wednesday (T. J. 231, *l.* 10). It seems that کم has been again miswritten as یک. 16th Khurdād was the 78th day of the Ilāhī year. Tuesday, 15th Khurdād is serially in order. If the 1st of Farwardīn was a Wednesday, 16th Khurdād (*i. e.* the 78th day of the Ilāhī year) must also have been a Wednesday.

VI. 358 last line. *I do not know what to call it—whether Samūmistān ......Bīmāristān......Zakūmdār or Juhannamābād.*

Recte, 'Zaqūmzār', (زقوم زار) as in the text, 231, *l.* 3 from foot and I. N. 115, *l.* 3 from foot. Niẓāmu-d-dīn Aḥmad's spelling is also زقوم زار in the Ṭ. A. B. I. text 243, *l.* 9 from foot; Lith. 309, *l.* 7 from foot.

VI. 359, *l.* 11 from foot. *Abū-l-Hasan......drew a picture of my Court and presented it to me.*

It was really a picture of the assemblage on the day of Jahāngīr's formal enthronement.

مجلس جلوس مرا در دیباچه جهانگیرنامه کشیده بنظر در آورد

T. J. 235, *l.* 19.

It was really a picture of Jahāngīr's coronation *darbār*, and was intended to serve as the frontispiece of the first volume of the emperor's 'Memoirs.'

VI. 359, *l.* 5 from foot. ***His father Ākā Razā, was always with me when I was a Prince.........I gave Abū-l-Hasan a good education and took care to cultivate his mind from his youth.***

پدرش آقا رضای مروی در زمان شاهزادگی من بخدمت من پیوسته

T. J. 235, *l.* 12 from foot.

"His father Āqā Raẓā of Marv had joined my service when I was a prince."

پیوستہ does not mean 'always' here, but 'joined'. The word which stands for 'education' is تربیت. It would be more appropriately rendered by 'patronage.'

از صغر سن تا حال خاطر همیشه متوجه تربیت او بوده تا کارش بدین درجه رسید

Ibid. l. 9.

"My mind had been inclined to patronise him ever since his boyhood, upto now, so that he reached this rank."

تربیت is often used in connection with the *patronage* of men of learning, poets and persons of merit by Budāūnī (text I. 52 last line; I. 212, *l.* 5; I. 234, *l.* 6 from foot).

VI. 360, *l.* 4 from foot. *May he be favoured with the ability of knowing the contents of it, which shall obtain for him God's grace and the blessings of His creatures!*

امید که توفیق دریافت این مطالب که باعث رضاجوئی خالق و دعاگوئی خلق است نصیب و روزی باد

T. J. 239, *l.* 14.

"I hope that he may, by God's grace, have the felicity [lit. happy lot] and good fortune to understand the real object of these actions or proceedings (of mine) which are recorded there, as that object has always been a desire to please the Creator and earn the blessings of His creatures."

As the sentence is involved and obscure, it may be permissible to quote Mr. Rogers' version. "I hope that the favour of the receipt of those writings which are intended for the satisfaction of the creature and for supplication to the Creator, may be a cause of good fortune" (II. 27). Mr. Rogers seems to have read رضاجوئی خلق و دعاگوئی خالق and has understood توفیق and دریافت differently.

VI. 362, *l.* 4. *When I was about sixteen or seventeen years (of age), I made at Allahābād a vow to God.*

پیش از این بشانزده و هفده سال در اله‌آباد باخدای خود عهد کرده بودم

T. J. 243, *l.* 15 from foot.

"Sixteen or seventeen years before this time, [the 13th year of his reign], I had vowed to God in Allahābād."

Jahāngīr is evidently referring to the time when he was in revolt against his father and had ventured to set up "a parallel government" at Allahābād in 1011–1012 H. He was then not 16 or 17, but about

thirty-three years old. This entry arrests attention in the diary of the 13th *Julūs*, that is, 1027 H. when he was in his 50th year (50–17 = 33).

VI. 366, *l*. 10. *The Nauroz of my fourteenth year corresponded with Rabī'u-l-ākhir 1028 H.*

Here, the date of the Hijra month is left out. It was the 4th. The week-day was Thursday مبارک شنبہ (T. J. 265, *l*. 5). So also in the I. N. 125, *l*. 2 from foot.

VI. 367, *l*. 6. *From the time of my disembarking from boats at Akbarpūr up to my reaching Hasan Abdāl, I have travelled 178 Kos during sixty-nine days in fifty-eight marches and one halt.*

The number of marches is given as 48 in the text 289, *l*. 5. Mr. Beveridge suggests that this Akbarpūr must be the place so called which lies about 12 miles northwest of Mathura (tr. II. 193 note), but this must be one of his many geographical solecisms. Jahāngīr himself tells us that he got out of the boats at Akbarpūr, which is two *Kurohs* from *Būrīya* near Jagadhrī in Ambālā district (text 283, *l*. 20). I am informed by a local authority that this Akbarpūr still exists and is near Darazpūr, which is a station on the North-Western Railway, about 16 miles south of Ambālā.

In *l*. 20, the Mīr Sāmān is spoken of as Sa'ādat Khān, but the text and the I. N. (134, *l*. 17) give the name as Irādat Khān, which is correct. 'Mirzā Ṣafavī' is also more specifically styled 'Mirzā *Rustam* Ṣafavī' in the text (289, *ll*. 5 and 11).

VI. 369, *l*. 7 from foot. *And the whole way the plum and guava trees were in blossom.*

و درخت زرد آلو و شفتالو صحرا صحرا شگوفہ کردہ سراپا
در گرفتہ بود

T. J. 290, *l*. 9.

'Apricots and *peaches*' would represent the meaning much more correctly. See my note on E. D. III. 556, *l*. 4 from foot in S. I. M. H. Vol. I. 375.

VI. 370 last line. *Sultān Mahmūd used to take a cup of sir and yet a mouthful is sufficient to create intoxication.*

سلطان محمود کاسہ کاسہ این سر میگرفت و لا جرعہ میکشید

T. J. 290 last line.

"Sultān Maḥmūd took cup after cup of this *Sir* and drank them all up at a draught." لاجرعہ is explained as drinking all at once whatever is in the cup without taking breath or little by little (*Ghiyāṣu-l-*

Lughāt). There is nothing corresponding to the exaggerated statement about the strength of the beverage in the text. What Jahāngīr really says is that its narcotic effects are artificially heightened by mixture with a soupcon of *bhāng* and that it stimulates the appetite [مشهي], but is harsh in taste and at best a very indifferent substitute for wine. Mr. Rogers understands لاجرعه کشید to mean that "he would drink a jar of it" (tr. II. 126), but جرعه has no connexion with 'jar' according to the dictionaries known to me. The meanings given by Richardson are "one draught, the remains of wine or of anything liquid at the bottom of a vessel or the last breath." لاجرعه کشیدن is perhaps best rendered "drain the cup to the dregs."

VI. 371, *l.* 12. *The mules are rendered weak and useless in consequence of the heavy loads which they have been made to carry* [*in Pakhli*].

T. J. 291, *l.* 8. استرش ریزه مي شود بجهت بارگران بکار نمی آید

"Its mules are small (or puny) and cannot be employed for carrying heavy loads."

VI. 372, *l.* 6. *It was Sultān Mahmūd who named this river Nain Sukh, which means 'the eyes' repose'.*

Mr. Beveridge in a reference to this passage asserts that "Jahāngīr (*Tūzuk*, 291) says it was Mahmūd of Ghaznī who called this river Nainsukh" (A. N. tr. III. 851 note). But the words 'of Ghaznī' do not occur anywhere in the *Tūzuk* and this Sulṭān Maḥmūd is not the iconoclast of Somanātha, but Sulṭān Maḥmūd of Pakhlī, the father of Sulṭān Husain, who was acting as the emperor's guide and host when the latter was passing through his territories. Mr. Beveridge's suggestion is a precipitate and fanciful conjecture of his own.

This 'Sulṭān Maḥmūd' is really the same ruler who is said, on p. 370 of these extracts to have tossed off cupful after cupful of the 'Sir' or strong rice-spirit or Pakhlī without getting intoxicated in the least.

VI. 375, *l.* 4. *In the month of Shawwāl 1029 H. his* [*Khurram's*] *forces invested the place* [*Kāngrā*], *the trenches were portioned out and the ingress of provisions was completely stopped.*

The year is wrongly given. It should be 1028 H. The military operations against Kāngrā really lasted for several years. After the failure of Murtaẓā Khān and Taqī, Rājā Bikramājit was sent on 7th

Shahrīwar of the 13th year of the reign (20th August 1618, O. S.) against Suraj Mal (T. J. 238, *l.* 9 from foot; tr. II. 26). But he opened the siege only on the 16th of Shawwāl 1028 H. (16th September 1619, O. S.). He came to court personally to report progress and "represent some of his requirements" on 29th Dai, and was permitted to return on the following day, of the 14th year (9th January 1620, O. S.) (T. J. 284, *l.* 17; tr. II. 114). As the fort surrendered, from lack of supplies, on the 1st of Muḥarram 1030 H. (16th November 1620 O. S.), the siege must have lasted for about fourteen months from 16th Shawwāl 1028 to 29th Ẕī-l-ḥijja 1029 H. The garrison's stock of provisions was exhausted in about ten months after the blockade began and the four months during which the besieged are said to have lived upon boiled dry grasses were the *four last* months of the fourteen months of investment. It is a mistake to suppose that the 'four months' are meant to define the entire duration of the blockade. It was only its fag end, the short period during which the besieged were suffering from famine.

VI. 375. *l.* 11. ***The place [Kāngrā] surrendered on Monday, Muharram 1, 1031.***

Recte, Thursday. The text has *Thursday*, 1st Muḥarram 1031 H., and the year is thus given in the I. N. 174, *l.* 12 also, but the true date must be 1030 H.

1st Muḥarram 1030 H. was *Thursday* 16th November 1620. 1st Muḥarram 1031 H. was Tuesday, 6th November 1621. Elsewhere, Jahāngīr states that the news reached him on Monday, the 5th of Muḥarram, 1030 H. = 9th Āẕar of the 15th regnal year (T. J. 318, *ll.* 11-20). See also I. N. 171, *l.* 9. Now 9th Āẕar is the 256th day of the Ilāhī year or the 325th of the Julian and it corresponded to 5th Muḥarram or 20th November only in 1030 H. In 1031, its Hijra synchronism would be *15th* Muḥarram. The correct date must therefore be *Thursday*, 1st Muḥarram 1030 H.

VI. 375, *l*, 13. ***As the saffron was in blossom, His Majesty left the city to go to Pāmpūr.***

There is a dislocation here and this is clearly manifested by the use of the words 'His Majesty' and the reference to Jahāngīr in the third person. The paragraph, as it stands here, is translated really from the *Iqbālnāma*, text 168, *l.* 4. It is true that Mu'tamid has borrowed it from a passage in the *Tūzuk*, but this description is found there in the lengthy dissertation on the natural scenery and fauna and

flora of Kashmīr which precedes and does not follow, as it is made to do by Dowson, the narrative of the conquest of Kāngrā. In the *Tūzuk*, this saffron-passage is found in the text on p. 315, *l.* 19; tr. II. 177, and the history of the long-drawn-out siege of Kāngrā is on p. 318, *l.* 20; tr. II. 183. Here, the relative position of the two extracts is just reversed. The fact seems to be that the English version of an extract from the *Iqbālnāma* has got mixed up and crept by error, into the series of excerpts from the *Tūzuk*.

The notice of Rājaurī which begins in *l.* 3, p. 376 is from the *Tūzuk*, p. 317, *l.* 8; tr. II. 180. It is also in the wrong order, as there, it precedes the reference to Kāngrā.

VI. 377, *l.* 11. *Letters arrived...reporting that the insurgents...had occupied many parts of the Imperial dominions.*

The text is fuller and more specific and states that they had all gathered together in Mehkar (321, *l.* 4 from foot). This place is in Buldhānā district, Berār and is marked in Constable, 31 Da.

VI. 377, *l.* 20. *Suddenly, they descended from the Bālāghāt, and stopped at Bālāpūr. Emboldened by their impunity, they meditated a raid round Bālāpūr.*

ناگذیر از بالا گهات فرود آمده در بالاپور توقف گزیدند آن
مقهوران دم تعاقب دلیر شده در حوالی بالاپور آمده بقزاقی
و برگی گری پرداختند

T. J. 322, *l.* 1.

The pronouns have been mixed up in this rendering in such a way as to mislead the reader. The first 'they' does not stand, as one would imagine, for the 'rebels' of *l.* 17, but for the 'Mughals'. The second 'they' relates to their adversaries, the Deccanīs. The passage may be better translated thus: "They (the Mughals) had consequently no other resource (ناگذیر not ناگزیر as Dowson seems to have read), than to descend from the Bālāghāṭ and halt in camp at Bāḷāpūr. The vanquished (Dekkanīs) were thus emboldened to pursue them and having come down within the environs of Bāḷāpūr, they took to their cossack tactics of harrying and plundering." Again, those who "lost their baggage in some fighting which occurred" afterwards, did not, as Dowson's rendering implies, belong to the "imperial forces", but to their adversaries. The "many who were killed or taken" were also followers of Malik 'Ambar and those who returned (سالماً غانماً) safe and with their booty to their quarters were not the "rebels," but

their victorious enemies, the Mughals. Compare R. and B.'s translation II. 189–190.

VI. 378, *l.* 3. *I conferred upon him ten Krors of dāms, to be collected from the country after its conquest.*

Two Krors, and not 'ten', in the text 322, *l.* 18 and also in Mr. Beveridge's translation (II. 190). But the I. N. has ten (176, *l.* 9) and the *'Amal-i-Ṣāliḥ* follows it (I. 136, *l.* 7 from foot).

VI. 378, *l.* 5 from foot. *I ordered Ustād Dāūd to make a sword, a dagger and a knife from it [the magnetic iron], but he represented that it would not bear hammering, and break into pieces.*

The fall of meteorites is often recorded in Persian histories and story-books, as it was looked upon as a portent. The author of the *Tārīkh-i-Nigāristān* relates that a piece of iron weighing 150 *mans* fell from the sky with a great noise in the neighbourhood of Jurjān. It was taken to the ruler of the country. Sulṭān Maḥmūd Ghaznavī obtained a portion of it and wanted to have a sword made of it. But this could not be accomplished as it split into fragments like grains of millet (Bombay Lith. 1829, p. 108, *l.* 5 from foot).

VI. 379, *l.* 13. *The Commander-in-Chief sent forward Khwāja Abū-l-Hasan, at the head of 3000 horse, to march rapidly.*

مدار المهامی خواجه ابوالحسن باپنجهزار سوار برسم
منقلاي تعين شد

T. J. 330, *l.* 5 from foot.

"The *Madāru-l-mahām* (Pillar of state affairs) Khwāja Abū-l-Ḥasan was, with 5000 men, appointed as advance guard." The 'commander-in-chief' was the prince Shāh Jahān. *Madāru-l-mahām* relates not to him, but to Abū-l-Ḥasan and was the *latter's* title. He was in fact, the prince's chief minister, adviser and director.

VI. 381, *l.* 14. *Although I had discarded the doctors and their advice, I now had faith in her [Nūr Jahān's] attentions.*

اگرچه پیش از این هم علاجي كه اطبا ميكردند بصلاح وصوابديد او
بود ليكن درينوقت مدار بر مهرباني او نهادم

T. J. 334, *l.* 2 from foot.

"Although the remedial treatment which had been adopted before this by the physicians was also in accordance with her counsel and good judgment, I now relied only on her loving-kindness."

The meaning seems to be that the physicians having exhausted the resources of their pharmacopœia, Jahāngīr had recourse to a

dietetic regimen under the direction and personal supervision of Nūr Jahān. Cf. R. and B's tr. II. 213–4. The treatment was to be a drugless one—a sort of nature-cure.

VI. 384, *l.* 15 from foot. *On the 24th* [*Mihr*], *I crossed the Jhelum.*

The river crossed was the Chināb, as the printed text has it (347, *l.* 3 from foot). Jahāngīr states that he had reached Bhimbar just twelve days before on 12th Mihr (*Ibid. l.* 4 from foot). He entered Lāhore ten days later on 4th Ābān (348, *l.* 7). The river which he crossed at Sulṭānpūr (p. 385, *l.* 4) must have been the Beās. See R. and B's tr. II. 238.

VI. 386, *l.* 17. *They encamped near Bilūchpūr.*

This Bilūchpūr must be the place of that name in Palwal *pargana*, about eighty miles north-west of Āgra, on the road to Dehlī. Shāhpūr, which is mentioned six lines higher up (*l.* 11) lies about ten miles south of Bilūchpūr (Irvine, Later Mughals, II. 80, 82). Still another village called Qabūlpūr is referred to in the text of the *Tūzuk*, 357, *l.* 9 as the place where Jahāngīr himself had pitched his camp. Palwal town is forty-one miles south of Dehlī, which lies about one hundred and twenty miles north of Āgra.

VI. 387, *l.* 6. *On the 30th* [*Ardībihisht*], *agreeing with 19th Rajab 1034, I encamped by the tank of Anāsāgar.*

Read 1032 H. The event relates to the 18th year of the reign, which began on the 20th Jumādī I, 1032 H. The text gives the date as Saturday, 9th Khurdād, or 19th Rajjab 1032 H. (T. J. 361, *l.* 12) and this is also what is found in R. and B's trans. II. 261. 19th Rajjab 1032 H. was 9th May 1623, but 9th Khurdād of the 18th *Julūs* year was 19th or 20th May 1623 = 29th Rajjab 1032 H. The I. N. gives the date as سی ام (30th) Khurdād and 19th Rajjab 1032 H. (205, *l.* 8). Here, 'Khurdād' must be an error for Ardībihisht. The correct synchronisms are

30th Ardībihisht, 18th R. Y. = 19th Rajjab 1032 H.
9th Khurdād, 18 R. Y. = 29th Rajjab 1032 H.

30th Ardībihisht cannot possibly be correct, as Jahāngīr states, in a passage left out by Dowson, that after prince Parwīz's appointment on 25th Ardībihisht, he bestowed the *Ṣūbadāri* of Gujarāt on prince Dāwar Bakhsh on the غره *i. e.* the first of Khurdād (T. J. 361, *l.* 5). The entry relating to the halt at Anāsāgar on 9th Khurdād = 19th Rajjab is printed seven lines lower down in *l.* 12. 9th Khurdād of the text is correct, but 19th Rajjab must be an error for *29th* Rajjab.

VI. 388, *l.* 5 from foot. *He [Shāh Jahān] said, 'In case of evil falling upon me, I trust myself and the honour of my family to you; something must be done that I may proceed no further in this wretched and miserable course.'*

This is a very loose paraphrase and not a translation at all.

وقت ما تنگ شده و کار بدشواری کشیده خود را بشما سپردم
حفظ عزت و ناموس ما برشما است کاری باید کرد کم زیاده برین
خواری و سرگردانی نکشم

T. J. 372, *l.* 3.

"My time is hard and my affairs have taken an unhappy (lit. difficult) turn. I have to place myself [entirely] in your hands. The preservation of my honour and reputation depends now upon you only. Something must be done, so that I may not have to endure greater indignity and distress."

VI. 389, *l.* 7 from foot. *The royal forces then continued the pursuit to the pargana of Ankot, forty Kos from Burhānpūr.*

'Ankot' is entered as a *maḥal* in the *Āīn.* tr. Jarrett, II. 229.

It is the 'Akoat' of Thornton, who says it is 32 miles southwest of Ellichpūr. Lat. 21°-3′ N., Long. 77°-9′ E. It is marked in Constable, 31 Da. as 'Akot'. It is now in Akolā district, Berār.

VI. 391, *l.* 4. *Sālih, brother of the late Āsaf Khān...put the fort in a state of defence.*

He was the *nephew* of Āṣaf Khān, or the son of his brother. See the extract from the *I. N.* in E. D. VI. 408 and R and B's tr. II. 298. The 'Alīgarh text reads برادر زاده آصف خان (382. *l.* 12 from foot and so also *I. N.* text 218, *l.* 4).

This Āṣaf Khān was Qawāmu-d-dīn Ja'far Beg, Āṣaf Khān, the third. He was the nephew of Ghiyāṣu-d-dīn 'Alī Qazwīnī or Āṣaf Khān, the second. 'Abdu-l-Majīd Harawī is, by way of distinction, styled Āṣaf Khān the first and Abū-l-Ḥasan (the brother of Nūr Jahān), Āṣaf Khān the fourth, by Blochmann [*Āīn.* tr. I. (reprint) p. 398.]

VI. 393, *l.* 4 from foot. *But the zemīndārs of the place showed their loyalty and collected thirty boats.*

The Persian text is more specific and states that these men were باس *i. e. Bais* Rājputs. (*Tattimma* of Muḥammad Hādī, 388, *l.* 2 from foot). Baiswāra is the country of the Bais Rājputs who are

supposed to have possessed twenty-two (Hindī *Bāīs*) parganas or districts in these parts. They are now found chiefly in the Unão and Rāi Barelī districts in Eastern Oude.

VI. 394, *l*. 4 from foot. *Yākūb Khān Habshī.....had arrived at Malkāpur, ten Kos from the city (Burhānpūr).*

The correct name seems to have been 'Yāqūt' (text 394, *l*. 14; *Iqb. Nām*. 240, *l*. 10; 243, *l*. 2 from foot, Muḥammad Hādī, *Tatimma* 391, *l*. 21).

The mistake occurs again on p. 432, *ll*. 3 and 7 and on p. 418, *l*. 3 the name is perverted into 'Yūsuf'. Here, as in several other places Dr. Benī Prasād has been misled by Dowson (History of Jahangir, 391-2).

The 'Alīgarh text locates Malkāpur at *twenty kos* (not ten), distance from Burhānpūr and the *I. N*. is in agreement with it (240, *l*. 9 from foot). The *M. U*. makes it eighteen *kos* (I. 240, *l*. 6 from foot). The real distance is about forty miles (Constable, 31 Da).

VI. 397, *l*. 13 from foot. *Alī Qulī Beg Istajlū who was educated under the instructions of Shāh Ismā'īl the second came and entered the service of the emperor Akbar.*

علي قلی بیگ استجلوکہ ازتربیت کردهاي شاه اسمعیل ثاني بود

Hādī, *Dībācha*, p. 20, *l*. 16.

Here تربیت cannot mean 'education', but must signify 'patronage, protection.' See note on E. D. VI. 359, *l*. 5 from foot. 'Alī Qulī was one of the protegés of the Shāh, one of those who had been patronised by him and received signal marks of his kindness. The word is derived from رب master, lord. Elsewhere also Jahāngīr describes the Rājputs as a طائفہ رعایت کرده و تربیت یافتہ پدرمن T. J. 13, *l*. 15 and states that Shaikh Farīd, Murtaẓā Khān was raised to a trustworthy post by his great father تربیت نموده و بدرجہ اعتماد و اعتبار رسانیده حضرت والد بزرگوار T. J. 159, *l*. 11.

Niẓāmu-d-dīn Ahmad says of 'Abdu-r-Rahīm Khān Khānān

شفقت عام و تربیت فضلا و علما و صحبت فقرا و طبع نظم اورا موروثی است

B. I. text II. 427, *l*. 1.

VI. 398, *l*. 2. *[The Emperor] placed her on the establishment of Rukiya Sultāna......on which she continued for a long time without any employment.*

مدتی در خدمت ایشان بناکامی گذرانید

Hādī : Dībācha, 20, *l.* 9 from foot.

"She [Mihru-n-nisā] remained for a time in her service in a state of hopelessness" [disappointment, discontent, grief, vexation, etc.]. In *l.* 16, the title of Nūr Jahān's brother Abū-l-Ḥasan should be read, not as I'timād Khān, but as I'tiqād Khān (*Ibid.* 21, *l.* 2). Dr. Benī Prasād says Mihru-n-nisā "was appointed a lady-in-waiting to the dowager-empress Salīma Sultān Begam" (Jahāngīr, 177), which seems to rest on the authority of the *Maāṣir-i-Jahāngīrī.* De Laet states that she "was commited to the care of the queen-mother, Rockia Sultan Begem" (tr. Hoyland, 180).

VI. 402, *l.* 10. *Khān Khānān, of his own accord, took him ['Alī Qulī Istajlū] into the Imperial service.*

خانخانان غایبانه درسلک بندهای درگاه منتظم ساخت

Iqb. Nām. text 23, *l.* 5.

Khān Khānān assigned to him a position among the imperial servants *in absentia*, although he had not been presented at court. *Vide* the note on E. D. VII. 276, *l.* 15 in S. I. M. H. Vol. I. 654.

VI. 403, *l.* 12. *Pīr Khān Kashmīrī, a brave officer, galloped against Sher-Afgan.*

The name is spelt as انبر خان Amba Khān in the *Tūzuk-i-Jahāngīrī*, text 54, *l.* 4 from foot and there is also a variant ابیّه Abiyya, which is sponsored by Khākī Shīrāzī (Ms. 219a last line) and it is probably correct.

VI. 403, *l.* 7 from foot. *He [Khwāja Muḥammad Sharīf] entered the service of the renowned king Tahmāsp and was entrusted with the Wazīrship of Yazd.*

The Bibl. Ind. text has

شاه وزارت خود را بخواجه محمد شریف تفویض فرمود

Iqb. Nām. 54, *l.* 6 from foot.

Muḥammad Hādī, who has copied the passage reads 'Marv' (*Dībācha.* 20, *l.* 4). According to him, Mirzā 'Alāu-d-dīn or 'Alāu-d-daula was not the father, but the *son* (پسر) of Āqā Mullā (*Ibid l.* 4 from foot). Both the statements are perhaps correct. There were two Āqā Mullās, one of whom was the grandfather of the other. See Blochmann's note *Aīn.* tr. I. 369, 497 and 508. Āqā Mullā, the elder, surnamed *Dawātdār* (secretary of state, lit. inkstand-bearer) had three sons, Mirzā Ghiyāṣu-d-dīn 'Alī (Āṣaf Khān II), Badī'u-z-zamān and

Aḥmad Beg. Āqā Mullā, the younger, was the brother of Ja'far Beg Qazwīnī (or Āṣaf Khān, the third), who was the son of Badī'u-z-zamān, ('Alāu-d-daula ?), the second son of Āqā Mullā Dawātdār (T. J. 27, *l.* 12; tr. I. 58; *Āīn*, tr. I. 369). The name of the grandfather is often given in the East to the grandchild (*Āīn*. tr. 497; See also 508 and note). The Āqā Mullā mentioned in the extracts from Asad Beg at p. 161 must be the younger man of that name who was given a *manṣab* of 1000 horse by Jahāngīr, soon after his accession. (T. J. 27, *l.* 12 = tr. I. 58).

VI. 404, *l.* 2. *In the city of Fathpūr, he [Mirzā Ghiyās Beg, the father of Nūr Jahān] had the good fortune to be presented to the emperor Akbar.*

This explicit mention of Fatḥpūr as the place where Ghiyāṣ Beg's first presentation to Akbar took place is not without interest or significance. Akbar left Fatḥpūr for the Punjab in 993 H. (1585 A. D.), and returned to Āgra only after 14 years in 1007. Nūr Jahān's birth must be therefore dated, at the latest, before 993 H.

If the *Maāṣiru-l-Umarā* is correct in stating that she was 72 years old at her death in 1055 H., she must have been born in 983–4 H. (*M. U.* I. 127; Blochmann, *Āīn*. tr. I. 510). The presentation of Ghiyāṣ Beg to Akbar must be dated in 983 or 984 H. and the tale told by Khwāfī Khān on the authority of an old man he met at Sūrat in 1107 H., must be an apocryphal legend if not a deliberate invention. See also S. I. M. H. Vol. I. 618–9.

VI. 405, *l.* 5. *No grant of lands was conferred upon any woman except under her seal.*

A sentence has been omitted here and the statement does not relate to Nūr Jahān, but to her nurse. What Mu'tamid Khān really says is :

پیر کنیز دای دلارام نام که بیگم را شیر داده بود بجای حاجی
کوکه صدر اناث شد و مدد معاشی که بعورات مرحمت میگشت
صدر الصدور بمهر او معتبر میداشت

Iqb. Nām. 56, *l.* 14.

"And the old slave-woman, Dāī Dilārām, who had suckled the Begam, became the chief of the female servants in her palace, and the subsistence-allowances which were bestowed on indigent women were sanctioned (or held valid) by the *Ṣadru-s-Ṣudūr* (or chief almoner of the state) if they bore her seal".

VI. 405, *l*. 6. *In addition to giving her the titles that other kings bestow, the emperor granted Nūr Jahān the rights of sovereignty and government.*

بغیر از خطبہ آنچہ، لوازم سزاوار سلطنت و فرمانروائي بود هم بفعل آمد

Iqb. Nām. 56, *l*. 4 from foot.

"All the proper and peculiar privileges of imperial sway and sovereignty came into operation (*i.e.* were actually possessed or enjoyed by her), except (only) the *Khuṭba*".

بغیر does not mean 'in addition to', but just the reverse, that is, 'except', 'without', 'saving'.

VI. 405, *l*. 14 from foot. *In any matter that was presented to her, if any difficulty arose, she immediately solved it.*

هرجا کار افتادۂ را عقدۂ پیش می آمد و بخدمت او ملتجی گشت
گرہ از کارش کشودہ کامیاب مراد ساخت

Iqb. Nām. 57, *l*. 5.

'Whenever a person whose affairs had fallen into ruin encountered any difficulty and sought her protection, the knot in his affairs was unravelled and he attained the object of his desires'.

VI. 408, *l*. 9. *Mahābat Khān sent an ambassador from Burhānpūr to Ādil Khan.........who wrote in reply that he would meet Mahābat Khān at Dewalgāon, and would send his son to enter the imperial service.*

This transaction is related very inaccurately. A Qāzī 'Abdu-l-'Azīz was sent as an envoy to 'Ādil Khān by Mahābat Khān. Malik 'Anbar also sent a person named 'Alī Shēr to Mahābat to convey his humble duties and professions of allegiance to the Emperor. He also expressed his desire to meet the Mughal general at Dewalgāon and undertook to send his eldest son to court for being enrolled in the imperial service. Letters were now received from Qāẓī 'Abdu-l-'Azīz assuring him of 'Ādil Khān's sincere devotion and loyalty and his determination to send Mulla Muḥammad Lārī as his agent and plenipotentiary (*Iqb. Nām*. 216, *l*. 11). The person who was to meet Mahābat and send his son to court was not 'Ādil Khān, but Malik 'Anbar.

VI. 408, *l*. 14 from foot. *He [Aḥmad Beg Khān] retreated in alarm to Pīpalī, the residence of the governor and [went off] to Katak (Cuttack), which is twelve Kos from Pīpalī, in the direction of Bengal.*

Mr. Beveridge notes that this cannot be Piplī in Bālāsore, which is nearer Bengal than Cuttack, but he cannot make up his mind in regard to its exact situation (R and B's tr. T. J. II. 298 note).

The place intended is really a towṇ in the Purī district of Orissa. It is registered in the I. G. XX. 404 and also in the 'Official Guide to Post Offices in India'.

Ibrāhīm Khān is here said to have had his forces scattered in different posts (*l*. 4 from foot), but the text is more precise and states that

Iqb. Nām. 218, *l*. 10. كومكيان او در سرحد مگهہ و دیگر تهانجات متفرق بودند

"His auxiliary troops were scattered on the Magh [Ārācān or Mug] frontier and other *ṭhāṇas*" (military stations or outposts in places of strategic importance).

VI. 410, *l*. 5 from foot. *The Sūba [of Paṭṇa] had been left in charge of Mukhlis Khān, the prince's dīwān and of Iftikhār Khān and Sher Khān, his faujdārs.*

What the B I. text states is that the حکومت و حراست governorship or *Ṣūbadārī* was entrusted to Mukhlis Khān. Allāhyār, *the son of* Iftikhār Khān and Shēr Khān Afghān were appointed *Faujdārs* (222, *l*. 10). See also Hādī, 385, *l*. 8.

VI. 413, *l*. 11. *Shāh Jahān was in the jungle of Kampat, where he had entrenched himself.*

کنیت and کنتس in the B. I. text 232, *l*. 2 and footnote. It must be Kantīt, which lies four miles between Mirzāpūr and Bindhyāchal, which are both stations on the Northern Railway. Mirzāpūr is fifty five miles south-east of Allāhābad. Bindhyāchal is four miles west of Mirzāpūr. The 'jungle' is the *kampaṭa araṇya* of the Rāmāyaṇa.

VI. 416, *l*. 11. *He [Malik 'Anbar] ... having brought up guns from Daulatābād, took Sholāpūr by storm.*

و توپ ملک میدان را از دولت آباد آورده قلعهٔ شولاپور را......

Iqb. Nām. 238, *l*. 3. دست...... مفتوح گردانید

"And having brought the great cannon named *Malik-i-Maidān* from Daulatābād etc."

Muḥammad Hādī has copied this passage also from the I. N. (*Tatimma* 393, *l*. 1). This is the famous gun which was first cast for Burhān Niẓām Shah of Ahmadnagar in 1548 A.D. (Irvine, Army, 124). Jahāngīr says it was so large that a man could sit comfortably in it and that its *stone shot* weighed ten Hindustānī *maunds*, that is, about 560 English pounds. The gun appears to have been used in the siege of Bījāpūr in 1687 A. D. and it may be still seen in that town (Imp. Gaz., XVIII. 186). It is of cast metal and there is a description of it in the

Narrative of Captain Little's Detachment, by Captain John Moor (p. 322). He calculated the weight of its iron shot to be 2646 lbs. (Irvine, *l. c.* 127).

VI. 416, *l.* 12 from foot. *Shāh Jahān placed his wife in the fort of Rhotās, and wrote to Dārāb, ordering him to come in person to the fort.*

بدارابخان نوشتند که درگذهي خود را بخدمت رساند

Iqb. Nām. 239, *l.* 1.

'Shāh Jahān wrote to Dārāb Khān ordering him to pay his respects to [or attend upon himself personally] at *Gaḍhī* (the Gate of Bengal). Gaḍhī is not used here for the fort, but for the place of that name which is now in the Sonthal *parganas* [Lat. 25°–10′ N., Long. 87°–35′ E. (Th) I. G. Atlas, 29 C2].

VI. 418, *l.* 11. *Hoshang, son of Prince Dāniyāl,......and Khān Khānān came in to wait upon Prince Parwez ... Khān Khānān expressed shame and sorrow for his actions, and the Prince consoled him. They were brought to Jahāngīr himself and made their obeisances to him. They were in the charge of Prince Parwez and 'Arab Dast Ghaib had been sent to bring them to the Emperor's headquarters.*

درین تاریخ عرب دست غیب که بجهت طلب هوشنگ پسر شاهزاده
دانیال و عبدالرحیم خان خانان نزد شاهزاده پرویز رفته بود
نامبردگان را آورده نخست هوشنگ آمده دولت زمین بوس
دریافت

Iqb. Nām. 244, *l.* 12.

Jahāngīr was then in Kashmīr and prince Parwīz in Mālwā. The Khān-i-Khānān was 'consoled' by Jahāngīr and not by the prince.

VI. 419, *l.* 16. *Mahābat Khān.........had realized large sums of money due to the State, and also from Jāgīrs.*

مبلغهاي كلي از مطالبات سرکار نزد او می آمد و نیز از محال جائیر
بندهای درگاه در وقت تغییر و تبدیل مبلغها متصرف گشته

Iqb. Nām. 248, *l.* 6.

"Large amounts of money representing the revenue and fiscal demands of the Exchequer had come to [*i.e.* fallen into the hands of] Mahābat Khān and he had also appropriated large sums from the revenues of the *jāgīrs* of many government officials in these days of (frequent) changes and transfers".

VI. 419, *l.* 18. ***A person called Arab Dast-ghaib was therefore sent to collect the elephants, and bring them to Court, also to obtain a settlement of accounts, and to return to Court if the result proved satisfactory.***

و مطالبات حسابي نيز ازو باز يافت نموده بخدمت شتابد و اگر اورا
جواب حسابي خرد پسند باشد بدرگاه آمده بديوانيان عظام مفروغ سازد

Iqb. Nām. 248, *l.* 10.

"'Arab Dast Ghaib was sent [not only to bring the elephants to court, but] to recover all the outstanding sums of money which Mahābat Khān owed to government and had been debited to him in the ledgers of the state. If he had any valid counter-claims to set off against the sums he owed, he was to come personally to the imperial court and settle accounts with the Chief Revenue Ministers".

VI. 419, *l.* 3 from foot. ***An answer to the dutiful letter of Shāh Jahān was written and forwarded, with a mace set with diamonds valued at a lac of rupees.***

This is all wrong. The letter as well as the mace was sent to Shāh 'Abbās of Persia, with his ambassador Āqā Muḥammad. The rebel prince had nothing whatever to do with either.

اقا محمد ايلچي شاه فلک بارگاه شاه عباس را رخصت انعطاف ارزانی
داشتم ...... مکتوبي در جواب محبت نامۀ شاهي نگارش يافت گرز مرصع
تمام الماس كه يک لک روپيه قيمت داشت ...... حواله او شد

Iqb. Nām. 252, *l.* 8.

"The emperor gave Āqā Muḥammad, the envoy of Shāh 'Abbās, leave to return [to Persia] and a letter in reply to the *friendly missive* of the Shāh was indited. A mace inlaid with diamonds, which had cost one lakh of rupees was also entrusted to him".

It is absurd to speak of محبت نامه as the dutiful letter of Shāh 'Abbās.

VI. 420, *l.* 13 from foot. ***He (Jahāngīr) sent for the young man, and treated him with great insult and harshness.***

Iqb. Nām. 253, *l.* 13. بخواري و بيعزتي كره كاري فرمودند

"The emperor ordered him to be *flogged* and disgraced". The كره was a horsewhip, a leather-thong or cowhide. Manucci describes it as a well-twisted rope in shape like an ox-tail, an inch in thickness and a fathom in length (Storia, II. 450). Hādī says that Barkhurdār was scourged with a rope ثلاق پست ورساخورد (T. J. 401, *l.* 13 from foot).

VI. 420, *l.* 17. *A message was sent forbidding him [Mahābat Khān] to attend at court until summoned.*

نخست پیغام شد کہ تامطالبات سرکار پادشاهی را بدیوان اعلی مفروغ نسازد و مدعیان خودرا بمقتضای عدالت تسلی ننماید راه کورنش و ملازمت مسدود است

Iqb. Nām. 253. *l.* 7.

"First, a message was sent to him to say that until the outstanding amounts due to the Imperial Exchequer were cleared off to the satisfaction of the Exalted Dīwān and until those who had preferred complaints [of tyranny and wrong-doing] against him had received redress according to Law, the privilege of making *Kūrnish* and attending at court would be withheld from him".

VI. 421, *l.* 1. *Mahābat Khān perceived ...... that he had no resource, for he had not a single friend left near the Emperor.*

درین وقت کہ هیچ کس از بندهای درگاه گرد و پیش آن حضرت نمانده بود

Iqb. Nām. 254, *l.* 8.

"At this time when not one of the servants of the court was round or before *His Majesty*".

The culprit is represented as the victim in this translation. It was not Mahābat who was friendless 'and without resource', but the poor emperor, who was craftily and suddenly attacked by the traitor, just at the time when he had no one near him except a few emasculated and unwarlike menials.

VI. 421, *l.* 10. *After prayers, and saying good morning to his comrades, he went round to inspect.*

بعد از فراغ نماز و ادعیہ بایاران مصاحب از هر جا حرفی و سرگذشتی درمیان داشت

Iqb. Nām. 254, *l.* 9 from foot.

نماز و ادعیہ is a collocation commonly used in connection with prayers. They are synonymous terms and volumes containing نماز و ادعیہ are found in all large collections of Persian and Arabic manuscripts. The word is frequently used in this sense by Khwāfī Khān, who speaks of Āghar Khān intruding upon Mīr Jumla, Khān-i-Khānān, when the latter was repeating his orisons seated on a prayer-carpet (text. II. 158, *l.* 8).

کہ خان خانان بر سرسجاده نشستہ مشغول خواندن ادعیہ بود

Elsewhere (II. 750, *l.* 3) he speaks of ادای نماز ظهر و عصر و ادعیہ
What Mu'tamid Khān wants to say is that "after going through his

prayers and *orisons* he was talking to his friends and associates about all sorts of matters and events".

VI. 423, *l.* 5. ***Mubārak Khān now came forward, and to satisfy him, took a place in the howda with the Emperor.***

مقرب خان خود را رسانیده باسترضای او درون حوضه نزدیک
بآن حضرت رفته نشست

Iqb. Nām. 258, *l*, 8.

"*Muqarrab Khān,* managing to approach, now got inside the *howda* and took a seat near the emperor with the consent of Mahābat Khān".

The *Tatimma* also calls him *Muqarrab Khān* (404. *l.* 2 from foot). As the name of the man who had charge of the emperor's wine (*l.* 9) is explicitly given in the B. I. text (I. N. 258, *l.* 11) as 'Khidmat Parast Khawāṣṣ', there is no justification for speaking of him as a 'personal attendant', and giving only a translation of the name.

VI. 423, *l.* 9 from foot. ***But as it happened, Nūr Jahān, thinking that His Majesty had gone out hunting, took the opportunity to pass over the river, to pay a visit to her brother, Āsaf Khān.***

قضارا در هنگامیکه حضرت شاهنشاهی بقصد سیر و شکار سوار شدند نورجهان
بیگم فرصت غنیمت شمرده باجواهرخان خواجه سرا از آب گذشته بمنزل برادر
خود آصف خان رفته بود

Iqb. Nām. 259 *l.* 5.

"But by chance it so happened that just at the time when His Majesty was mounting his horse for going out to hunt, Nūr Jahān Begam, making the best of the opportunity, had crossed the river with the eunuch Jawāhir Khān and reached the encampment of her brother, Āṣaf Khān".

VI. 425, *l.* 6. ***Others [of Fidāī Khān's men] through the coldness of the water, were unable to proceed.***

The word in the printed text is تندی 'Violence, impetuosity, swiftness'. The Jhelum is a very rapid river and its current runs in places at the rate of three or four miles an hour (Thornton, Gazetteer, 450). On p. 427, *l.* 19, Dowson himself states that the water was deep, and the ***stream was running strong.***

VI. 427, *l.* 13. ***Āsaf Khān now came in sight; his companions were scattered, and his plan had failed, so he departed. I sought and shouted for his followers, but could not find them or any trace of them.***

درین وقت آصف خان پیدا شدند و از نیرنگی زمانه و از بیراهه رفتن
رفیقان و بدنشینی نقش گله اغاز کرده روانه شدند و سخن تمام نشده مجلس
تمام شد و هرچند از ایشان بچشم و زبان نشان خواستم اثری ظاهر
نشد که بکدام جانب رفتند

Iqb. Nām. 264, *l.* 11

"At this time Āṣaf Khān turned up [showed himself] and began to complain querulously of the untowardness of the times, the going astray of his coadjutors and the miscarrying of his projects. He then went away and the meeting was dissolved before the discourse was finished. All my efforts to get sight of or to hear of him produced no result and I could not find out where he had gone". The verb is used in the plural number only by way of respect and the pronoun ایشان also stands for Āṣaf Khān himself and not for "his followers". This stands out clearly from the paraphrase of Muḥammad Hādī who writes:

درین وقت آصف خان پیدا شد و از نیرنگی زمانه گله اغاز کرده روانه شد و
هرچند حاضران از ایشان نشان خواستند اثری ظاهر نشد که بکدام جانب
شتافت

T. T. J. 406, *l.* 1.

VI. 428, *l.* 5. *Next day, he [Fidāī Khān] crossed the river and repaired to his sons who were in Rohtās.*

The text gives some details which are left out here. Fidāī Khān who had his family (فرزندان lit. children) in Rohtās went there and taking them placed them under the protection of Badr [or Zar] Bakhsh Janjūha, the *zamīndār* of the *pargana* of Girjhāk-Nandna, who was an old friend of his (*I. N.* 265, *l.* 8 from foot).

VI. 428, *l.* 15. *Āsaf Khān bowed to Fate and bound himself by promise and oath to uphold Mahābat.*

و آصف خان بهمه وجه محنتی وبلای بر خود قرار داده عنان بقضا سپرد
و فرستادهای مهابت خان نحوی بعهد و سوگند آرام بخش خاطر متوحش
اوگشته حقیقت را بمهابتخان نوشتند

Iqb. Nām. 267, *l.* 8.

"And Āṣaf Khān determined to put up with all the troubles and calamities that might be in store for him and resigned himself to Fate. The emissaries of Mahābat Khān, having by oaths and promises, ***tranquilised***, in some sort, ***his distracted heart***, reported the fact to Mahābat Khān".

For 'bargīgiri' (last line) read 'bargīgarī', as in the text, p. 271, last line.

VI. 429, *l.* 19. ***His Majesty, in his good nature and gentleness, had now become reconciled to Mahābat Khān, and showed him great favour and kindness.***

حضرت شاهنشاهی ازکمال حوصلہ و بردباری آن قدر بجانب او رفته بودند و بعدي عنایت و التفات ظاهر می ساختند

Iqb. Nām. 274, *l.* 2 from foot.

"His Majesty, exercising *self-control* and *patient endurance* to perfection, [seemingly] went over to his side to such an extent and outwardly displayed such favour and kindness".

Jahāngīr was only playing a part. His gushing kindness and favour was intended only to double-cross Mahābat and divert that rebel's attention from his real designs. He must have possessed great command of his feelings and also a power of profound dissimulation.

VI. 430, *l.* 13. ***It would be better therefore for him [Mahābat] to postpone the usual parade of the first day.***

بهتراین است کہ شما مجرای اول روز را موقوف دارید

Iqb. Nām. 276, *l.* 6.

"It would be better for you to defer, (attendance at) the early morning's *mujrā*, (obeisance or *salām*) or the *first mujrā* of the day, ***i.e.*** the morning levee".

Khwāfī Khān speaks of Najābat Khān having been forbidden to attend the levee by Aurangzeb.

II. 47, *l.* 8. از منصب برطرف و از مجرا ممنوع فرموده بودند

See also for other examples *Ibid* II. 191, *l.* 6; II. 200, *l.* 6 from foot = E. D. VII. 277, 281.

Irādat Khān was punished in the same way soon afterwards and the very same words are used again (101, *l.* 6). The ***Ghiyāṣu-l-lughāt*** notes that in Hindustān مجرا is used for ملاکات امرا و سلام و تسلیمات *i.e.* giving audiences to Amīrs and taking their salutes and obeisances. See also M. U. II. 724, *l.* 13; 880, *l.* 10.

Hawkins, Coryat and Terry tell us that Jahāngīr used to hold court three times a day, *viz.* about sunrise, noon and sunset (Foster, E. T. I. 115-6, 247, 326). This مجرای اول روز was the early morning ***darbār.***

VI. 430, *l.* 9 from foot. ***His Majesty followed close after, and making no stay at the first stage, he made two stages into one, and passed over the river to Rhotās, where he found a court ready to receive him.***

مواب ظفر قرین پاشنم کوب نهضت فرمود و در منزل پیش نیز نتوانست پاقایم
کرد دو منزل را یکی کرده از آب رهتاس گذشته فرود آمد و دولتخانهٔ
Iqb. Nām. 276, *l*, 12. پادشاهی درین طرف آب آراستگی یافت

"And the victorious courtage of the emperor followed close upon his [Mahābat's] heels. He [Mahābat] did not dare to make a halt at the next stage, but combined two stages into one and encamped only after he had crossed the river of Rohtās [*i.e.* the Jhelum]. His Majesty's royal tent became then the ornament of *this* side of that river".

Mahābat had been ordered by Jahāngīr to go on one stage in advance of the royal camp. He felt that he was not strong enough now to defy the emperor and obeyed the command. But as he knew that he was liable to be caught up and compelled to fight at a disadvantage any day, he was anxious to march as quickly as possible and put the natural barrier of the river between himself and his pursuers. Cf. also Hādī, *Tatimma*, 411, *l.* 18.

VI. 431, *l.* 14 from foot. *Āsaf Khān ...... was also appointed prime minister, and the order was given for him to preside permanently over the administration of all affairs, revenue and political.*

The post to which he was appointed was the وکالت and the words used (از روی استقلال تمشیت مهمات مالی و ملکی پرداز د) really imply that he was given full powers and authorized to act as the regent of the kingdom or deputy of the sovereign (وکیل مطلق). Jahāngīr appears to have been completely prostrated and lost what little energy he had after Mahābat Khān's *coup d'etat*, and the administration was left entirely to Nūr Jahān and her brother.

Abū-l-Fazl mentions among Akbar's *Vakīls* Bairām Khān, Mun'im Khān, Ātgah Khān, Bahādur Khān, Khwāja Jahān, Khān Khānān Mirzā 'Abdu-r-Rahīm and Khān-i-A'ẓam Mirzā Koka (Blochmann, *Āīn*. Tr. I. 527). There was no *Vakīl-i-mutlaq* in the reign of either Shāh Jahān or Aurangzeb. In that of Bahādur Shāh, Asad Khān was appointed to the post, and Khwāfī Khān, in recording the event, observes that "in former reigns, the appointment and removal of *wazīrs* and all other high officials used to be in this grandee's [the *Vakīl-i-mutlaq's*] hands" (text II. 600. *l.* 15; E. D. VII. 401).

VI. 433, *l.* 8 from foot. *Niẓāmu-l-Mulk ...... made Hamīd Khān ...... his commander-in-chief.*

The word used is *Peshwa* پیشوا (*Iqb. Nām.* 284, *l.* 1; Hādī 415, *l.* 11) which really means 'Lord Protector, Vicegerent or King *de facto*'.

VI. 435, *l.* 7. *Just at this moment, Shahriyār inopportunely fell ill.*

درین وقت سلطان شهریار ناشدنی بمرض داءالثعلب آبروی خود ریخت

Iqb. Nām. 291, *l.* 3 from foot.

"At this time Sultān Shahriyār, the good for nothing, lost his honour [lit. the light on his face] on account of the fox's disease". ناشدنی 'unpromising, worthless' is really a nickname or abusive epithet applied to Shahriyār. 'Inopportunely' is absolutely wrong. The reading is ابروي (eyebrows), not آبروی in Hādī (T. J. 420, *l.* 18). 'Abdu-l-Hamīd Lāhorī explicitly states that Shahriyār was called ناشدنی on account of his "want of capacity and intelligence" and was "commonly known by that appellation or nickname" (E. D. VII. 5 = *Bādshāhnāma*, B. I. text, I. i. 69).

VI. 435, *l.* 18. *The stricken animal bounded off to its females.*

همین کم باهو رسید از فراز تیغم کوه جدا شده معلق زنان آمده برروي زمین مي افتد

Iqb. Nām. 292, *l.* 8 from foot.

"At the moment the bullet reached the deer, it leapt (lit. separated itself) from the top of the ridge and taking a somer-sault, came down to the ground".

زنان does not mean 'females' here. It is the participial form of زدن. معلق زنان is again used in the last line and it is said of the poor man who lost his footing and slipped down from the hill that he also معلق زنان بحال تباه برزمین افتاد "fell head over heels on the ground in a most deplorable state or manner". معلق means 'suspended or hanging in the air'.

VI. 438, *l.* 1. *Khān Jahān was joined by Daryā Khān Rohilla ...... at Burhānābād.*

This was the name given by Burhān Niẓām Shāh to a suburb founded by himself, near Ahmadnagar town. Coins struck at this Burhānābad by Burhān in the name of Akbar are known.

VI. 438, *l* 8. ***On the 2nd Jumāda-l-awwal, 1037 H., agreeing with 10th Bahman ...... Shāh Jahān was proclaimed at Lāhore, and the Khutba was read in his name.***

یکشنبہ بیست و دوم جمادالاول Sunday 22nd in the *Iqb. Nām.* 303, *l.* 9 and calculation proves 22nd to be correct. 10th Bahman would be the 315th day of the Ilāhī year and equivalent to 20th January. 22nd Jumādī I (*Rūyyat*) was Sunday, 20th January 1628 A. D. Ind. Ephem.). Muḥammad Hādī also has 22nd Jumādī I (T. J. 425, *l.* 10 from foot).

VI. 438, *l.* 9 from foot. *The new emperor now [some day in Jumādīu-l-awwal 1037 H.] celebrated his thirty-eighth birth-day (solar reckoning).*

جشن وزن مبارک شمسی سال سی و هشتم از عمر ابد پیوند
آرا ئنگی یافت

Iqb. Nām. 304, *l.* 9.

There is some miscalculation here. Prince Khurram was born on 26th Dai of the 36th regnal year of Akbar (A. N. text III. 603; Tr. III. 921) or 30th Rabī'u-l-awwal 1000 H. (*Bādshāhnāma*. I. i. 16, *l.* 5) *i.e.* 5th or 6th January 1592 A. D. Jumādī I. 1037 H. commenced on 29th Dec. 1627 A. D. He must have completed the 36th year only of his life according to the *solar* reckoning. هشتم is almost certainly an error for ششم. It will not do to urge that هشتم may be correct and that 'solar' has been wrongly written for 'lunar'. It could not have been the 38th lunar anniversary, because Mu'tamid Khān himself states that the جشن وزن قمری سال سی و هفتم 'festival of the lunar weighment of the 37th year, was celebrated a fortnight before this date at Sīnor on the banks of the Narmadā (*Iqb. Nām.* 301. *l.* 13).

The *Bādshāhnāma* states quite correctly that the 'Jashan' marking the termination [انتہا] of the 36th and the beginning ابتدا of the 37th solar year was celebrated on 8th Jumādī I = 25 Dai at Māndal in Udaipūr (I. i. 80, *l.* 7).

The '*Amal-i-Ṣāliḥ* also declares that it was the

جشن وزن مبارک شمسی سال سی و ششم

(I. 218. *l.* 10) feast of the 36th solar year. Hādī makes it the festival of the 37th solar year. He perhaps means that the 36th ended and the 37th began on that day (T. J. 426, *l.* 6).

VI. 484, *l.* 2 from foot. *Tārīkh-i-Muhammadī is likewise the name of an historical work that somebody composed, and the Sirāj-i-'Afīf is another.*

This 'somebody' was Muḥammad, the son of Bihāmad Khān, fief-holder of the district of Irach in Bundelkhand, under Junaid Khān,

the brother and Wazīr of Nāṣiru-d-dīn Maḥmūd Shāh of Kālpī. It is a "General History from the time of Muḥammad to 842 A. H. with special reference to India" (Rieu. Catalogue, I. 84). See also my article on the "Coins of Jalal Shāh Sultān in Num. Supp. No. XLII to the J. A. S. B. for 1930, Art. 289.

VI. 517, *l.* 2 from foot. *He [Jalāla Ṭibaṭibā] is also the author of the Persian translation of the Taukyāt-i-Kisravīyā.*

These 'Institutes of Khusrav Anūshīrvān' were edited and translated by Mr. William Young, I.C.S., (a judge of the High Court of Allahābād) in 1894 A. D. A Nawal-Kishore-press lithograph also exists. The work contains nothing of interest to the student of Indian history, except a story interpolated by the translator Ṭabāṭibā about Jahāngīr. Some skilful engravers had forged the royal seal and issued false *farmans* which deceived many of the governors of the *Ṣūbas*. When they were caught, Jahāngīr refused to punish them on the ground that "they had done this thing under extreme necessity and the overpowering force of starvation" and let them off with a warning as they showed "signs of profound penitence". He even allowed them "a fixed sum from the treasury for their support" (p. 7). A similar story of stupid and whimsical clemency is told of Muḥammad Shāh (Sarkār-Fall of the Mughal Empire, I. 9 note).

VI. 574, *l.* 2 from foot. *It [the Tārīkh-i-Ḥaidar Rāzī] is quoted under the name of Tārīkh-i-Mirzā Haidar, by Nizām-ud-dīn Ahmad Bakhshī, as one of the chief sources of his information.*

There is confusion or lapse of memory here. The history quoted by Niẓāmu-d-dīn is the *Tārīkh-i-Rashīdī* of Mirzā Ḥaidar *Dūghlat* (*q. v.* E. D. V. 127–135). Ḥaidar *Rāzī's* work is stated to have been begun only in 1611 A. D. and completed after twenty years *i.e.* in 1631 A. D. As Niẓāmu-d-dīn Aḥmad died in 1592 A. D., it is impossible that he could have quoted or made any use of it.

VOL. VII. SHĀHJAHĀN TO MUHAMMAD SHĀH.

VII. 8, *l.* 9. *Thereupon Khān Jahān wrote a letter of contrition and obedience, in the hope of obtaining forgiveness.*

There is nothing to warrant the use of the words 'contrition' and 'forgiveness' in the original.

عرضه داشتی مبنی از اطاعت و انقیاد و پذیرائی اوامر و نواهی بدرگاه
آسمان جاه ارسال داشت

(*Bādshāhnāma*, B. I. text, I. i. 272, *l.* 8 from foot).

"He forwarded to the Court of heavenly dignity a petition made up of professions of submissiveness and loyalty and willingness to obey all positive commands and prohibitions". The purport of the letter is given a little more fully in the counterpart passage in the *'Amal-i-Ṣāliḥ* (Bibl. Ind. text, I. 347, *ll.* 16–21). Khān Jahān did not profess to have been repentant or pray for 'forgiveness'. He appears to have carried himself very proudly from the first notwithstanding the marks of imperial displeasure and to have given himself airs of injured virtue and persecuted innocence.

VII. 10, *l.* 6 from foot. *The Khwāja Abu-l-Ḥasan sent him [Sher Khān] to attack the fort of Batora, in the vicinity of Chāndor, near Nāsik and Trimbak.*

Dowson states (E. D. VIII, Index p. xxxix) that this 'Batora' is the same as 'Rola', which is mentioned at E. D. VII. 53; but this conjectural identification is by no means easy to accept as there is not a shadow of resemblance in sound between the two names. I venture to say that the correct restoration is Pāṭoda پاتوده. It is now a town in Nāsik district, lying about 14 miles north-west of Yeola (Constable, 31 Ca). The actual situation of the two places also differs greatly, as Rola lies, according to Dowson, nineteen miles west of Chāndor, Pāṭoda is situated about twenty miles south-east of Chāndor. See my note on E. D. VII. 53 in S. I. M. H. Vol. I. 633.

Paṭōda was the chief town of a subdivision first in the district of Ahmadnagar and afterwards of Nāsik after the British conquests (B. G. XVII. 435, 529; XVI. 226, 274). It still contains the ruins of several mosques and buildings of the Mughal period.

VII. 12, *l.* 4 from foot. *Khān Jahān was at Rājaurī, twenty-four Kos from Machhlī-gānw, employed in dividing the spoil which his predatory followers had obtained by plundering the merchants at Kehūn and Kīorāī.*

This 'Kīorāī' كيوراي must be گيوراي Gevrāī, a town in Bhīr district, Ḥaidarābād State. Rājaurī and 'Machhlīgāon (*Recte*, Mānjalgaon) also are in Bhīr. Thornton states that 'Givaroi' is 51 miles south-east of Aurangābād in Lat. 19°–17′ N. Long. 75°–49′ E. Mānjalgāon is in Lat. 19°–20′ N. Long. 76°–15′ E. about thirty-five miles north-east of Bhīr. The latter is in Lat. 19°–0′ N. Long. 75°–55′ E. (Thornton). All the three places are shown in Constable Pl. 31.

VII. 13, *l.* 5. *A'zam Khān left a detachment [at Machhlīgāon] and marched off to Pipalner, six kos from Bīr.*

Pīpalner lies a few miles east of Bhīr and is marked in Constable Pl. 31, Db, as 'Pīmpalner'. There is another town of the same name in Khāndesh (Constable, 31 Ca), with which this one should not be confounded.

VII. 16, *l.* 2. *Khān Jahān ...... went to Īr-Kahtala, half a Kos from Daulatābād, and a few days later Khān Jahān removed his family to Aubāsh-darra, a place within cover of Daulatābād.*

This 'Īr-Kahtala' is almost certainly wrong, as the name is afterwards spelt اوپر کہتکہ 'Upar Kahatka' by 'Abdu-l-Ḥamīd himself in his lengthy account of the siege of Daulatābād (B. N. text, I. i. 508, *ll.* 11, 17; 520. *l.* 7; 524, *l.* 12).

The *Ghāṭī* of Aubāsh-darra is also mentioned there (I. i. 508, *l.* 18). The latter place is given a slightly different name in the *Maāṣir-i-'Ālamgīrī*. Muḥammad Sāqī states that 'Āb-pāsh darra' and the *Bāgh-i-Farmān Bārī* (Farmān Garden) were visited by Aurangzeb, and the gardeners handsomely rewarded, when that emperor was at Aurangābād in 1093 H. (B. I. text, 217, *l.* 6 from foot).

The name of the old Hindu quarter of Deogīr was 'Kataka' (Gibb, Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, 227; Defremery IV. 46) and 'Ūpar-Kataka' may perhaps signify the upper or northern part of Kaṭaka, the old Hindu quarter of Daulatābād.

VII. 16, *l.* 8 from foot. *Next day, they marched to Jāmkhīr in the Niẓām-Shāhī territories ...... Leaving a force there, he next day proceeded to Tilangī.*

Jāmkheḍ is now in Ahmadnagar district, about forty-eight miles south-east of Ahmadnagar town. Constable, Pl. 31 Cb, Lat. 18°-45′ N. Long. 75°-22′ E. Tilangī must be Telangsī, an old village about eleven miles east of Jāmkheḍ. Its antiquity is borne witness to by a Hemādpantī temple of Jaṭāśaṅkara with nine domes (Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. XVII, Ahmadnagar, p. 740).

VII. 17. *l*. 18. *Bākir Khān proceeded to the pass of Kherāpāra, two Kos from Chhatar-dawār. This is a very narrow pass, between the territories of Kutbu-l-Mulk and Orissa ...... He retired without making any attempt on the fort of Mansur-garh (which lies about four Kos from Kherāpāra).*

These places have hitherto baffled identification, but 'Abdu-l-Ḥamīd gives two clues, which enable us, when rightly interpreted, to fix the situation. In the first place, he states (I. i. 373, *l*. 6 from foot) that Chhatar-dwār was about twelve *kos* distant from Mahindrī. Sir J. N. Sarkār does not say where Mahendri was (Journal, Bihar and Orissa Research Society, II. 157), but the late Dr. R. D. Banerjea has erroneously supposed it to be the same as Rajahmundry (History of Orissā II. 38). It is really Mahendragiri in Ganjam (Constable, Pl. 32 Db). Chhatardwār and Mansūrgarh of the *Bādshāhnāma*, must be Chatarpūr and Mansūr Kotāh, which are both situated in close proximity to each other in the same district and are also marked in Constable's map. 'Abdu-l-Ḥamīd's second clue is that the Rājās of Khallīkot and Kūdla and Āl had the good sense and good fortune to act as Bāqir Khān's auxiliaries. There can be no doubt that Khallīkot is the place of that name in Ganjam which is shown in Constable's map as 'Kallīkot' and lies twenty-three miles north of Chatrapur (*Bādshāhnāma*, I. i. 333, *l*. 7 from foot and I. i. 373, *l*. 6 from foot). Chatrapūr and Khallīkot (or Kallīkot) are now stations on the South-Eastern line. Chatrapūr is only five miles from Ganjām town and fourteen miles north of Behrāmpūr. Mansūrkota is twelve miles south-west of Ganjam, and eight miles east of Behrāmpūr. I understand from a local official that a place called 'Khorāpāḍā' still exists about four miles from Chatrapūr.

VII. 19, *l*. 6. *'Abdulla Khān reached Nūlāhī, and Saiyid Muzaffar Khān having left Dīpālpūr, reached Mankod on the 5th, on his way to Mandīsor, when he learnt that the rebels had*

turned off to the right. On the 6th, he again marched, and came to Tālgānw ...... On the 10th, they encamped at Khiljīpūr.

This 'Mankod' is, probably, 'Mandode', which is shown in the map prefixed to Sir J. Malcolm's 'Memoir of Central India', (edit. of 1823). It lies about fifteen miles north-east of 'Deypaulpoor', which is in Lat. 23°-0′ N. Long. 75°-45′ E. (Thornton). Khilchīpūr, which was reached after five marches, lies about 90 miles N. E. of Dīpālpūr in Lat. 24°-2′ N. Long. 76°-34′ E. Dīpālpūr is now in Indore state (Constable's Atlas 27 Bd). Tālgāon is most probably the 'Tāl' of Constable's 27 Bd. It lies about sixty miles north of Dīpālpur and 75 miles south of Mandisor. (Lat. 24°-3′ N; Long. 75°-8′ E). 'Nūlāhī' is Thornton's 'Nolye' which lies 29 miles south-west of Ujjain. It is now called 'Barnagar' Lat. 23°-3′; Long. 75°-23′ (Constable 27 Bd).

VII. 20, last line. *On the 28th Jumād-s-sānī, on arriving at the village of Nīmī, in the country of Bhānder, the royal army learned etc.*

Spelt باندهو in the B. I. text (I. i. 348, *l.* 11) and also in the M. U. (I. 761, *l.* 2). The *'Amal-i-Ṣāliḥ* reads the name as باندهور (I. 402, last line). 'Abdu-l-Ḥamīd states that this village of Nīmī was fifteen *kos* distant from Sehonda and thirty *kos* remote from Allāhābād (text, I. i. 348, *l.* 10). A glance at the map will show that the 'country' or ولايت cannot possibly be the Bhānder, which lies north-east of Jhānsī.

Allāhābād is in Lat. 25°-22′ N. Long. 81°-52′ E. Bhānder (Constable, 27 Dc) is in Lat. 25°-51′ N. Long. 78°-58′ E. This means that Bhānder must be at least 200 miles to the west of Allāhābād. Again, as Sehonda lies in Bānda district, about thirty miles north of Kālinjar (Constable, 28 Bc) and about sixty, west of Allāhābād, it cannot possibly be only fifteen *kos* distant from Bhānder. Jhānsī is 245 miles west of Allāhābād. There can be little or no doubt that Nīmī was somewhere in the modern Bānda district. Bānda town is 95 miles south-west of Allāhābād (Thornton). Bānda district appears to have been at this time, included in the territories of the principality of Bāndhū or Rewā, which was then ruled by Amarsiṁha, a grandson of Rājā Rāmchand of Bhaṭa or Bhaṭgoṛa, that is Rewā.

VII. 24, *l.* 6. *Next day, he captured the town and fort of Bālnī ...... He then marched to Māndū and from Māndū to Dhārūr.*

Dowson says in the footnote that "the maps give no such name as Māndū between Parenda and Dhārūr. I suggest that the place meant is 'Māndva' in Naldrug, Ḥaidarābād State. It lies north-east of Parenda on the road from that place to Dhārūr and is shown in Constable, Pl. 31 Db. A'ẓam Khān is said, in the text (I. i. 361, *l.* 10) to have marched from this 'Māndū' to Dhārūr "in a night between" [شب درمیان] and 'Abdu-l-Ḥamīd states elsewhere that this 'Māndū' was *ten kos* from Dhārūr (*Ibīd*, I. i. 344, *l.* 9).

VII. 28, *l.* 8 from foot. *Āsaf Khān then marched [from Bhālkī] towards Kalānor, a flourishing place belonging to 'Ādil Khān. When he arrived at Sultānpūr, near the city of Kulbarga etc.*

The name is written Kamalāpūr in the 'A. Ṣ. I. 467, *l.* 1 and this is probably the right reading. Elsewhere, 'Abdu-l-Ḥamīd states that Kamalāpūr lies sixteen *kos* from Kalyāṇī in Bīdar district (*Bād. Nām.* I. ii. 151, *l.* 5 from foot and 153, *l.* 16). This Kamalāpūr still exists and has a post office (P. O. G.). Bhālkī is about 25 miles north-west of Kalyāṇī.

This Sultānpūr was only a suburb contiguous to Gulburga که بشهر کلبرگه اتصال دارد (*Bād. Nām.* I. i. 413, *l.* 4). It is mentioned again in juxtaposition with Hīrāpūr in these extracts from the *Bād. Nām.* on p. 54. They are described as قصبات عامرهٔ عظیم in the text (I. ii. 152, *l.* 4 from foot). They were not independent cities, but only prosperous and thickly-populated suburbs of Gulburga. Both these places still exist about two miles distant from the town of Gulburga.

VII. 29, *l.* 7. *Then he advanced to the vicinity of Bījāpūr, and encamped on the borders of a tank between Nauraspūr and Shāhpūr.*

Shāhpūr was about two miles to the north-west of Bījāpūr town. It was a suburb founded by 'Alī 'Ādil Shāh I about 1557 A.D., and is said to have been inhabited, in the days of its glory, by no less than 9,00,000 persons. The tank of Shāhpūr—a great *Ḥauẓ* covering several acres of ground—was the chief source from which Bījāpūr city was supplied with water. It is again mentioned at p. 54 of this volume. Nauraspūr was about four miles north-west of Bījāpūr (Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. XXIII, Bījāpūr, p. 578).

VII. 31, *l.* 6 from foot. ***Under the pretence that a building was necessary for their transactions in buying and selling, they erected several houses in the Bengali style.***

بهانهٔ آنکه براي خريد و فروخت مکاني ضرور است بدستوري بنگاليان خانهٔ چند ساختند

B. N. I. i. 435, *l.* 6.

"They did so" *with the permission* (بدستوري) of the rulers of Bengal.

They had come to the country "during the *rule* of the Bengalis" (در عهد بنگاليان *l.* 3). دستور is a word of many meanings and is used for 'custom, practice'. But دستوری signifies 'permission, leave' رخصت or اجازت as the *Ghiyās* states. Here بنگاليان cannot mean 'people' of Bengal, but the 'Kings' or 'Sultans'. J. J. A. Campos states (History of the Portuguese in India, 36–9) that they first landed at Chittagong in 1533 A. D., and that during the struggle with Sher Khān, Maḥmūd Shāh of Bengal solicited their assistance and promised in return to grant them land to erect their factories and permission to build factories in Chittagong and Sātgāon. "He even appointed Nuns Fernandez Freire as chief of the custom house at Chittagong, granted him land with many houses empowering him to realize rent from the Moors and Hindus who lived there and gave him many other privileges over the people. The custom house of Sātgāon ...... was given to Joao Correa. The people were indeed surprised to see that the king had given the Portuguese so much power and such a firm footing in Bengal. This was the first establishment of the Portuguese in Bengal, almost simultaneously in Chittagong and Sātgāon". Indeed Anloneo Nunez refers to Sātgāon as early as 1554 A. D. (*Ibid*, 47). But the '*Amal-i-Ṣāliḥ*' has understood these words very differently, and the sentence is paraphrased thus by its author.

نخست درآنجا خانهٔ چند مانند انديشهاي پراگندهٔ خويشتن سهل و سست اساس نهادند

'A. Ṣ. I. 495. *l.* 4 from foot.

"At first, they laid the foundations only of houses easily erected and unstable like their own distracted intentions". Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ evidently means that the Portuguese built only what were called بنگله *Banglas*, flimsy bamboo-built huts or cottages covered with roofs of thatch. 'Abū-l-Faẓl tells us in his description of the *Ṣūba* of Bengal that "the houses are made of bamboos, some of which are so con-

structed that the cost of a single one will be five thousand rupees or more" (*Āīn*, tr. Jarrett, II. 122). Budāūnī also notes that "one of the remarkable things in the Kingdom of Bengal is that some houses called *Chapparband* cost 30000 or 40000 rupees each, although they are only covered with wood" (text, II. 182, *l.* 6 from foot; Tr. Lowe, II. 185). The word بنگلہ is used for wooden Kiosks or summer-houses of some sort more than once in the *Bâdshâhnâma* of 'Abdu-l-Ḥamīd (I. ii. 240, *l.* 12; 241, *l.* 7; II. 177, last line), as well as the *'Ālamgīrnāma* (text 451, 468), and the *Maāṣir-i-'Ālamgīrī* speaks of a بنگلۂ چوبی (473).

The English word 'Bungalow' is undoubtedly derived from this 'Bangala'. Hodges tells us that "Bungalows are buildings in India, ... which consist of only one story. The plan of them usually is a large room in the centre ...... and rooms at each corner for sleeping; the whole is covered with one general thatch, which comes low to each side; the spaces between the angle-rooms are *viranders* or open porticoes" (Travels in India, Ed. 1793, p. 146). Another old author, Dr. Francis Buchanan writes that "the style of private edifices, that is proper and peculiar to Bengal, consists of a hut with a pent roof constructed of two sloping sides which meet in a ridge, forming the segment of a circle ...... This kind of hut, it is said, from being peculiar to Bengal, is called by the natives, 'Banggolo', a name which has been somewhat altered by Europeans, and applied by them to all their buildings in the cottage style, although none of them have the proper shape and many of them are excellent brick houses". (Report on Dinagepore in Montgomery, Martin's Eastern India, II. 922). See also Yule, Hobson-Jobson, *s. v.* Bungalow.

Indeed, Caesar Federice, speaking about 1565 A. D., of the early Portuguese factory at Betor near Howrah, writes thus: "they make and unmake a village with houses and shops made of straw, and this village standeth as long as the ships ride there and till they depart for the Indies, and when they are departed, every man goeth to his plot of houses and there setteth fire on them" (Purchas, Pilgrims, V. 411, 439).

The fact of the matter appears to be as Dr. Hosten puts it that for nearly fifty years after their first settlement the Portuguese in Bengal were not allowed to build godowns but of bamboo and thatch which were burnt down regularly every year when they returned to Goa" (Bengal Past and Present Jan.-March, 1915, pp. 42-3).

It will be seen that both these interpretations, diverse and conflicting as they are, fit in fairly well with the facts and it is not safe to dogmatise about the correctness of either. The word دستوری and دستور are equivocal.

VII. 31, *l*. 8. *Some of the inhabitants, by force, ... they infected with their Nazarene teaching, and sent them off in ships to Europe.*

در جهازات خود بفرنگ می فرستادند

B. N. I. i. 434, *l*. 6 from foot.

Here, as in other places, فرنگ must be used for the 'Portuguese possessions on the west coast of India' and not for 'Europe'. It is not likely that these wretched converts were sent all the way to Portugal, at a time when the voyage took six months, if not more. The game would have been scarcely worth the candle and it is not easy to conceive any motive for playing it. See my note on E. D. V. 407, *l*. 5 from foot in S. I. M. H. Vol. I. 544-5.

VII. 33, *l*. 14. *Allāh Yār Khān ...... in a single night, reached the village of Haldīpūr, between Sātgānw and Hūglī.*

This is now called 'Holodpūr', and lies north-west of Hūglī. [Blochmann, tr. *Āīn*. I. (reprint), 560 note].

VII. 36, *l*. 7. *He ventured to show his disaffection to Nusrat Khān.*

Recte, Naṣīrī Khān as in the B. N. text, I. i. 449, *l*. 13 and 'A. Ṣ. I. 517, *l*. 4. The correct form is given by Dowson himself at pp. 25, 38 and 39 of these extracts. Naṣīrī Khān was the governor of Mālwā at this time. He is the Khān Daurān of pp. 44, 52. His original name was Khwāja Ṣābir. He at first got the title of Naṣīrī Khān, and subsequently those of Nuṣrat Jang and Khān Daurān (M. U. I, 749-55).

VII. 40, *l*. 13 from foot. *Surrender of the fort of Nabātī near Gālna*

نباتی is an error for نبايت or نيبايت Nabāyat or Nībāyat *i.e.* Nimbāyat in Nāsik district. It lies about ten miles north-west of Nāndgāon. "Though now a small village, it has the remains of an old fort and some old tombs. It has a curious effigy also of the horse on which the prophet Muḥammad is said to have ridden to heaven" (Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. XVI. Nāsik, p. 639). It is shown on the map prefixed to the Gazetteer, about twenty-five miles south of Gālnā.

Nāndgāon lies about twenty miles south of Mālegāon which is about fourteen miles south of Gālṇā, *q. v.* S. I. M. H. Vol. I. 627.

VII. 47, *l.* 9 from foot. *The son [Bikramājit] acted accordingly, ... but he was attacked at Āshta in Mālwa by Khān-i-Zamān, Nāzim of the Pāyīn-ghāt, when many of his men were killed.*

This is all upside down. The names of the two Mughal commanders are mixed up and the credit given to just the wrong person. Bikramājit had gone to the Bālāghāṭ as an auxiliary of Khān Zamān (not Khān Daurān, as on this page), the *Nāẓim* of the *Bālāghāṭ*. Khān Zamān was not only so careless and negligent as to allow him to escape, but so indolent and remiss in his duty, as to take no steps to follow him instantly and nip the disaffection in the bud. The duty of pursuing the fugitive and blocking his path had to be taken up in consequence by Khān Daurān who was the *Nāẓim* of the *Pāyān* ghāṭ. 'Abdu-l-Ḥamīd writes thus:

چون خان دوران کہ در برهانپور بصوبہ داری پایان گهات می پرداخت
آگهی یافت کہ خان زمان ناظم مہمات بالا گهات بہ تگامشی آن مردود در
نیامد با راجہ بهار سنگہ ... و سایر منصبداران از برهانپور بطریق یلغار در
عرض پنج روز بمقام آشتہ از مضافات صوبہ مالوه بفوج مخالف رسیده

B. N. I. ii. 95, *l.* 2 from foot.

"When Khān Daurān, who was in command at Burhānpūr as Ṣūbadār of the Pāyānghāṭ learnt that Khān Zamān, the *Nāẓim* of the Bālāghāṭ, had done nothing (or not troubled) to pursue that reprobate, he, with Rājā Bhār [Pahār] siṁha and other *Manṣabdārs* made a forced march from Burhānpūr and in the course of five days, encountered (lit. reached) the forces of the enemy at Āshta, one of the dependencies of the *Ṣūba* of Mālwā". cf. also *'Amal-i-Ṣāliḥ* II. 100, *l.* 5; Khwāfī-Khān, I. 507, *l.* 9; M. U. I. 753.

VII. 48, *l.* 12. *Rājā Debī Singh ...... took the little hill of Kahmar-wālī from Jajhār's men.*

Major Luard thinks that this must be 'Kumarra', which lies about five miles north-west of Orchha (Gazetteer of the Central India States, Vol. VI. A, text, p. 27). His opinion is entitled to respect, but 'Kahmar-wālī' is said in the text to be only one *kos* from Undcha (B. N. I. ii. 107, *l.* 1), and the phonetic resemblance between the two

names is also hardly such as to be convincing. In the *'Amal-i-Ṣāliḥ* the name is spelt کمروری Kamarwalī or Kamrolī (II. 111, *l.* 2).

VII. 48, *l.* 10 from foot. *After resting one day at Undcha, the royal army crossed the Satdhāra on which the town stands.*

This is another name of the Betwa. It is said to mean 'seven streams' or according to others, 'one hundred streams'. Thornton says that the Betwa "receives many small streams right and left" (*s. n.* Betwa). *Sapta* means 'seven' and *shata* 'one hundred' in Sanskrit.

VII. 50, *l.* 13. *Udbahān and his brother, Siyām Dawā, sons of Jajhār who had fled towards Golconda, were afterwards taken.*

Siyām (Shyām) Dawā was not the brother of Udaibhān or the son of Jhujjhār-siṁha, but a servant who was the *Muṣāḥib* مصاحب *i.e.* an older companion, attendant, protector or guardian of the younger son of Jhujjhār, whose name is nowhere given. What 'Abdu-l-Ḥamīd really states is that Jhujjhār sent away his sons, Udaibhān and his younger brother *and* Siyām Dūwā, who was his confidential servant, together with a large body of servants towards Golconda.

پسران خود اودیبهان و برادر خردش و سیام دواکه معتمد او بود و
جماعت دیگر جانب گلکنده روانه ساخته
B. N. I. ii. 114, *l.* 5.

Elsewhere also (= E. D. VII. 52), we read

هفتم [شوال] اودیبهان پسر ججهار و برادر خرد او و سیام دودا ....
که خود را بولایت گلکنده کشیده بودند
B. N. I. ii. 139, *l.* 13.

The mistake is due to the conjunction between خردش and سیام and او and سیام having been missed out or overlooked.

'Dawā' or 'Daowā' appears as a suffix in other cases also. An influential local chief named Lachhman Daowā had made himself master of the great Bundelkhand stronghold of Ajaigarh in 1809 A. D. and Colonel Martindell was able to take it and dispossess him only "after a severe fight" (Luard, Central India States Gazetteer, Vol. VI. A. text 248; see also *Ibid*, 264). The 'Daowās' were really brāhmaṇs by caste, and the surname appears to be only a dialectical form of 'Dauba' 'Daubē' or 'Dūbē', that is 'Dvivedī', just as 'Chaubē' stands for 'Chaturvedī' (Luard, *op. cit.* 176). There are many Chaubē *jāgīrs* still in the Bundelkhand Political Agency.

Sehūr (VII. 50, *l.* 10 from foot) is 'Sehore' in Bhopāl (Constable, Pl. 27, Cd).

VII. 53, *l.* 7. *Shāyista Khān reported that Sālih Beg, the Nizāmu-l-Mulkī commander of the fort of Kherdarak had confined all Sāhū's men who were in the fort and had surrendered it to the imperial commanders.*

The *'Amal-i-Ṣāliḥ* speaks of it as کہنر درگ 'Kahnar-drug' (II. 159, *l.* 3 from foot). If this is correct, it *may be* 'Kanhera', one of the forts on the Chāndor range, which is situated about seven miles north-west of Dhodap. "It was one of the seventeen strong places which surrendered to the British after the fall of Trimbak in 1818 A. D." (B. G. XVI. Nāsik, p. 448).

'Kher-drug' was one of the *Konkan* forts surrendered by Shivājī after the treaty of Purandhar (Sarkār, Shivaji, 156, 157; H. A., IV. 80) along with Muranjan (Prabāḷ), Māhulī etc. which are now in Ṭhāṇa district. The context points to the name intended being 'Kanhardrug', as Shāyista Khān is said to have been sent with 5000 horse, against the forts of Juner, Sangamner, Nāsik and Trimbak, on the 8th of Ramazān (p. 52), and he is said to have actually taken the first two of them (p. 54).

VII. 54 foot note 2, *l.* 2. *Maknāth is ten Kos from Bhālkī and two (Kos) from Bīdar.*

The name of this village is written مکتہانم in the corresponding passage of the *'Amal-i-Ṣāliḥ* (II. 172, *l.* 2). Musta'idd Khān also states that Aurangzeb encamped on the borders of the lake of *Kumthāna*, near Bīdar (*M. 'Ā.* 309, *l.* 2). The village of that name still exists at about four miles distance from Bīdar and has a branch post office. See P.O.G.

VII. 55, *l.* 11. *Capture of Sarādhūn, Dhārāsīyūn, Kāntī six Kos from Sholāpūr, and the town of Deogānw.*

Deogāon is a very common place name and not easy to identify. There is a Deogāon about four miles south of Pariṇḍa. Dhārāsīyūn, modern Dhārāshīva (Osmānābād), on which the Mughal army is said to have fallen back, lies about 30 miles south-east of Pariṇḍa.

VII. 59, *l.* 6. *As soon as the waters [of the Ghodnadī] abated, he [Khān Zamān] crossed the river and encamped on the banks of the Indan, near Lohagānw, and Sāhū who was seventeen Kos distant, then made into the mountains of Gondhāna and Nūrand.*

The name of the village on the Indan is written لوہ گانو 'Lohgāon' in the B. I. text of the *Bādshāhnāma* (I. ii. 226, *l.* 4), but نوگانو 'Naugāon' in the 'A. Ṣ. (II. 213, *l.* 10). The compiler of the historical sketch in the Poona District Gazetteer supposes this 'Lohgānw' to be identical with the fort of Lohgarh (B. G. XVIII. Pt. iii, p. 442). But the conjecture receives no support, from either of the readings in the contemporary chronicles and must be rejected. There *is* a village called Lohgāon, about ten miles north-east of Poona, and three miles south of the Indan (or Indrāyaṇī), on the route to Shirūr (Indian Atlas Sheet 39, S. W. *apud* Sarkār, H. A. I. 47 note), and it may be the place intended. The hills of 'Nūrand', to which Shahājī fled must be those of 'Pūrandhar', پورندر. 'Nūrand' *is almost certainly, a miswriting of* that toponym. Gondhāna (Koṇḍāṇa or Siṃhagaṛh) lies about 15 miles south-west of Poona and Purandhar twenty miles south-east of it.

VII 60, *l.* 12 from foot. *Accordingly, the forts of Juner ...... Harīs, Jūdhan, Jūnd and Harsīrā were delivered over to Khān Zamān.*

Jūdhan is not Jalodhan, as stated in S. I. M. H. Vol. I. 634, but *Jīvdhan* "a fortress commanding the Nāṇe pass, sixty-five miles north-west of Poona and sixteen miles west of Junnar. It stands on a steep and rugged hill which rises about a thousand feet above the crest of the Nāṇe pass ...... In 1489 A.D., Jīvdhan was taken by Aḥmad I, the founder of the Ahmadnagar Niẓāmshāhī family, and in 1637 A.D. it was one of the five Poona forts which Shahājī gave to the Moghals" (Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. XVIII, Part iii, pp. 139–140). Jūnd is Chāwaṇḍ. It "lies ten miles north-west of Junnar and ten miles south-east of the Nāṇe pass. The road from Junnar to Chāwaṇḍ runs through a valley between two ranges of hills, one with Haḍsar fort stretching to the north-west and the other with the forts of Chāwaṇḍ and Jīvdhan running to the south-west. These three forts ...... effectually guarded the Nāṇe pass and preserved a safe communication between Junnar and the Konkan" (*Ibid.* p. 124). Harsīra (*recte.* Haḍsar) must be the third member of this trinity. It lies eight miles north-west of Junnar and sixty miles north of Poona (*Ibid.* 131). The *dāl* has been wrongly deciphered as a *rā*. Harīs is said to be in close proximity to Trimbak (M. U. III. 115, *l.* 2 from foot).

VII. 62, *l.* 16 from foot. *Two strong forts [in Little Tibet] the higher of which was called Kaharpūcha, and the other Kahchana.*

'Kaharphūcha' is, probably, 'Kharbū'. Sir A. Cunningham states, on the authority of a local chronicle of Ladāk, that when Aḥmad Khān, the chief of Baltī invaded Ladāk with the assistance of the emperor Jahāngīr, Singgi Namagyāl collected his own troops and defeated the invaders with great slaughter at Kharbū. Kharbū, he says, is situated on the left bank of the Kanjī river and lies on the high road from Baltī to Leh, the capital of Ladāk. It is one of the two chief places in the district of Purīg (Ladāk, p. 323 and Notes). Drew says it is situated on the road from Shrīnagar to Leh *via* Dras (Zojī pass) and Kargil and is about thirteen marches (about one hundred and seventy miles) distant from Shrīnagar (Jammū and Kashmīr State Territories, 532, 231). The 'A. Ṣ. says there are two routes from Shrīnagar to Tibet, one *via* کمراج (Kamrāj) and the other by the Sar Valley. It spells the names as کربوچم and کاچناک Kachnāk (II. 255, 260, 261, 263).

VII. 65, *l.* 5 from foot. *The army then proceeded to Koh-hatah, towards Utarkol, between Srīghāt and the Kajlī, there to pass the rains.*

Srīghāt lies, at the mouth of the Bar Nadī, opposite to Gauhāṭī and only a *kos* distant from it. Kajlī is not a river, but a town situated at the mouth of the Kallang river and is described as the spot where Assam begins. The 'Bar Nadī in Kāmrūp and the Kallang in Nowgong are shown in Constable's Atlas, Pl. 30. Srīghāt is marked on the map prefixed to Sir Edward Gait's History of Assam, a few miles south of Hājo and north of the Brahmaputrā. See also Blochmann, J. A. S. B. 1872, Pt. i. p. 69.

VII. 68, *l.* 7 from foot. *His [Āṣaf Khān's] mansab was nine thousand personal and nine thousand horse, do-aspah and sih-aspah, the pay of which amounted to sixteen krors and twenty laks of dāms. When these had all received their pay, a sum of fifty laks of rupees was left for himself.*

As sixteen *krors* and twenty *lakhs* of *dāms* are equal to only forty *lakhs* and fifty thousand rupees, and as this was all that he received, it is obvious that fifty lakhs could not possibly have been left for himself *after* paying off the allowances due to his troopers. What 'Abdu-l-Ḥamīd really says is

از آن روکر تیول جید سیر حاصل تنخواه یافته بود هر سال پنجاه لک روپیه بدو عاید می شد

B. N. II. 258, *l.* 16.

"But as he had obtained highly productive districts as his *jāgīrs* or fiefs, fifty *laks of* rupees used annually to accrue to him (from their revenues)". The real meaning is that, according to the regulations governing the salaries of *Manṣabdārs*, the total amount due to him was only forty *lahhs* and fifty thousand rupees, but for the reason stated, his *actual* income from the districts he held in fief was fifty *lakhs* of rupees. The identical explanation of the origin of Āṣaf Khān's enormous wealth and emoluments of his *manṣab* actually bringing in fifty *lakhs* annually, although nominally estimated at only forty, is found in the *'Amal-i-Ṣāliḥ*, (II. 348, *l.* 7). 'Alī Mardān Khān's *manṣab* of seven thousand *do aspa*, *sih aspa* brought in thirty lakhs annually to him (*'Amal-i-Ṣāliḥ*, III. 246, *l.* 11 = E. D. VII, 124). Manucci states that the pay of the commander of five, six and seven thousand horse (first class) was two million fifty (?) thousand, three million and three million five hundred thousand' rupees, respectively (Storia, Tr. II. 373–4). Here 'fifty thousand' seems to be a slip for *five hundred* thousand.

VII. 74. *l.* 15. *The writer of these wretched lines, Muhammad Tāhir... bearing the title of Ināyat Khān bin Muzaffar Khān bin Khwāja Abū-l-Hasan, represents ...*

On p. 73, the name of the author's father is stated to have been 'Ẓafar Khān' *bin* Khawāja Abū-l-Ḥasan and this is correct. The title of the author's father, *as printed here*, is quite wrong. Muẓaffar Khān was a Bārha Sayyid whose personal name was Abū-l-Muẓaffar. He is the person so called who is frequently mentioned in these extracts in connection with the pursuit of Khān Jahān Lodī and the expedition against Jhujjhārsiṁha Bundela. He was afterwards given the title of Khān Jahān (*M. U.* I, 758–765).

The Muẓaffar Khān, who is mentioned as governor of Mālwā in the last year of Jahāngīr's reign on p. 8, *l.* 2 of these extracts, was 'Abdu-r-razzāq Ma'mūrī (*M. U.* III, 376–9). The personal name of 'Ināyat Khān's father is given as Aḥsanullāh and his title as Ẓafar Khān in the M. U. (II. 756–763). That author notices another Ẓafar Khān also who bore the name of Shukrullāh and was the son of Zain Khān Koka (*M. U.* II. 755–6) and not of Khwāja Abu-l-Ḥasan Turbatī. The two *amīrs* named Ẓafar Khān are clearly distinguished in that excellent work.

VII. 79, *l.* 10. ***The Prince [Aurangzeb] then marched from the neighbourhood of Faizābād and encamped at Chalkai, which lies contiguous to the city of Balkh.***

This 'Chalkai' is another apocryphal place-name, begotten by the imagination of the translator, on the common noun جلگا *Jalgā*, which means 'meadow, plain'.

The '*Amal-i-Ṣāliḥ* states that the prince halted on the 15th of Ramaẓān at a جلگاي near the city of Faiẓābād (III. 13, *l.* 7 from foot).

A جلگا is a great plain between mountains. Bābur tells us that a *Julgā* is known as *Dūn* in Hindūstān. It is a 'dale' or 'pastoral valley' through which a river runs, with villages and meadows along its sides (B. N. tr. 461-2). The Persian translation puts it thus :. بزبان هندوستان جلگا را دون میگفتم اند 179, *l.* 11 from foot. See also E. D. IV. 217. The M. U. also writes that "Dehrādūn is a Jalgā outside the hills of Shrīnagar (Garhwāl) twenty *Kos* long and five broad" دون جلگاي ست بيرون كوه سرى نگر بدرازى بيست كروه و پهناي پنج كروه (I. 778, *l.* 13).

VII. 80, *l.* 10. ***As it was an arduous task to cross the pass of 'Arbang in one day, the victorious prince [Aurangzeb] ...... waited on the further side till the entire army was over.***

This name is written عرشك in the '*A. Ṣ.* III. 14, *l.* 3 from foot. They are both grievously mangled forms of غزنيك 'Ghaznīk' or 'Ghazniyak', which lies about twenty miles south of Khulm or Tāshkūrgān and forty north of Haibak. The perversion is due to the shifting of the dots. Ghorī which is mentioned a few lines lower down on the same page (*l.* 3 from foot) is situated about forty miles south-east of Haibak. It is shown in the map prefixed to Holdich's 'Gates of India' and also in Constable, Pl. 22, Cc, as 'Kala Ghorī'. (قلع غوري).

Tīmūr is stated to have marched from Turmuz by way of Khulm, *Ghaznīk* and Samangān (Haibak) to Indarāb. See my note on E. D. III. 400, *l.* 11 in S. I. M. H. Vol. I. 347.

VII. 80, *l.* 3 from foot. ***The day they had to march from Ghorī by way of Khwāja Zaid the road to the next stage, ... on the banks of the Surkhāb, was extremely difficult.***

A village named Khwāja Zaīd is mentioned by Bābur as lying four or five marches north of Ghūrband on the road to Kābul (B. N. 195) and somewhere near Doshī (*Ibid.* 193) which lies about twelve miles south-east of Ghorī (Erskine, Memoirs, 132n.) ‘Abdu-l-Ḥamīd mentions five routes from Kābul to Balkh by way of the pass of Ṭūl, Khwāja Zaīd, Khinjān, Ābdarra, and Maidān. He states that the Khwāja Zaīd route marched by Ghorband (22 *kos* from Kabul)—Ghorī (34 *kos*)—Haibak (16 *kos*) and Balkh (30½ *kos*) (Bād. Nām. II. 668–670). The stages of the return route from Balkh to Kābul are thus enumerated in greater detail by another author, Ghazniyak—Ghorī—Surkhāb river—Bek Shahr-Chihār Chashma—pass of Hindū Kush—Ghorband—Charīkār—Kābul (Wariṣ, *Shāhjahān Nāma* apud Sarkār, H. A. I. III. note).

VII. 81, *l.* 13. *After the camp had advanced beyond Shabūrghān, during the march to Nek Bihār and to Chār-Chashma, some injury occurred to the troops ...... When they started from Chār-chashma for the foot of the Hindū Koh range, it was resolved ......*

This name ‘Nek Bihār’ occurs again on the very next page, *l.* 2 from foot and it is stated there that “the pass of Nek Bihār lies two marches from the Hindū Koh”. The name, as thus written *looks like* a miswriting of Gulbihār, but the ‘A. Ṣ. calls it نکی شهر (III. 17, *l.* 3) and Wāriṣ نکی شهر (Sarkār, H. A. I. 111 note). Gulbihār or Gulpahār is mentioned by Bābur in juxtaposition with Parwān, Istalif and Khwāja Sih Yārān and said to be on the Panjshīr road (B. N. 226, 320–1 note, 406–7). It is mentioned as lying near Ghorband and one of the passes of the Hindū Kush and Panjshīr by Abū-l-Faẓl also (A. N. text I. 269, 275 = tr. I. 517, 526). ‘Abdu-l-Ḥamīd speaks of it as near Panjhīr (B. N. II. 461, *l.* 3) and Parwān (462, *l.* 7). See also *Ibid.* II, 513, *l.* 7; 462, *l.* 15; 514, *l.* 10. Yule states that one of the five Lower Panjshīr passes which is called Shatpal “starts from Gulbahār at the entrance of the valley and joins the Bāzārak pass on the other side at Kishnābid or Kistābād, twenty-one miles from Khinjān” (Wood, Journey to the Source of the Oxus, Edit. 1872, Introd. p. lxv). But the place intended here cannot be Gulpahār, as it lies on the wrong direction that is east, or north-east of Kābul whereas Ghorband and Surkhāb are situated to the north-west of it.

Khwāja Zaīd near Doshī and Ghorī are situated to the west or north-west of it. In fact, Gulpahār lies on what 'Abdu-l-Ḥamīd calls the route of the pass of Ṭūl, whereas the road by which Aurangzeb now returned was that of Khwāja Zaīd—a very different one. The Ṭūl route was the one by which Murād Bakhsh had marched to Balkh in the nineteenth year and it ran *via* Chārīkār, Parwān, Gulpahār, Ṭūl, Sarāb and Qunduz (B. N. II, 512–525). It is not easy to say what 'Tang Shahr' or 'Yak Shahr' is meant for and even Sir Jadu Nāth has not attempted to indentify it. I venture to suggest that the real name *may be* تنگ شبر 'the pass of Shabr or Shibr—the Shibr-tū of Bābur, Mirzā Ḥaidar, Abū-l-Fazl and also of our maps. The name is written in two different ways in the manuscripts of the *Maāṣiru-l-Umarā as* تنگ شتر *Tang-i-Shatar* and تنگ شر *Tang-i-Shar* and is spelt in the *Akbarnāma* as تنگ شیر *Tang-i-Shīr* (M. U. I. 422 and note). تنگ شبر *Tang-i-Shibr* which I have suggested *may be* the correct solution.

VII. 83, *l*. 4 from foot. *He [Bahādur Khān] then set out with the treasure, and reached Balkh along with his comrades, after an interval of fourteen days from the time of the Prince's [Aurangzeb's] arrival there.*

The context shows that 'Balkh' is a slip for 'Kābul'. The '*Amal-i-Ṣāliḥ* has it right (III. 17, last line) and so also Khwāfī Khān (B. I. text I. 678, *l*. 2).

VII. 88, *l*. 15 from foot. *It was ordered that subsidiary grants of money out of the state exchequer should be made ...... at the rate of 100 rupees for every individual horseman, which would be a lac for every hundred.*

The arithmetic is obviously bad, and the author must have meant to write a *lac* for every *thousand*. The 'A. Ṣ. has it right thus :

سر سواري صد روپيه كه سر هزار سوار يك لك روپيه باشد

III. 71, *l*. 12.

VII. 89, *l*. 15. *When the victorious camp started from Jahāngīrābād, intelligence reached the court that [Qandahār had been lost].*

This is the place which is called Jahāngīrpur in the T. J. (44, *l*. 4 = Tr. I. 90) and also Jahāngīrābād (317 last line; tr. II. 182; tr. I. 448 note). It is there said to lie about 9 *Kos* north-west of Lāhore. It is frequently mentioned by 'Abdu-l-Ḥamīd, who states that it was a favourite hunting-ground and also known as 'Haran Minār', because

a great tower had been erected there by Jahāngīr's orders, over the grave of a favourite antelope (B. N. I. ii. 14, *l.* 6; II. 141, *l.* 6 from foot; 221, *l.* 2 from foot, 500, *l.* 13, 501, *l.* 4; 571, *l.* 6 from foot, 634, *l.* 4 from foot). The tower and the inscription are still in existence. (Syed Muḥammad Laṭīf, History of Lahore, p. 45; Eastwick, Punjab hand-book, p. 200, *Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica*, 1909–10, p. 103). It is now known as Shaikhūpūr. The author of the *Khulāṣatu-t-tawārīkh* states that prince Salīm had founded a village called 'Shaikhūpūr' at Sāhūmalī near Lāhore and that it was afterwards given the name of 'Jahāngīrābād' (text 453, *l.* 2 from foot).

VII. 89, *l.* 21. *He [Shāh 'Abbās] despatched ...... Sāz Khān Bāligh ...... to subdue Zamīndāwar.*

Read 'Sarū Khān Tālish', as in 'A. Ṣ. III. 80, *l.* 2 from foot and 81, *l.* 5. Zainu-d-dīn Tālish was governor of Chākan under the Bahmanīs in 1488–9 (F. text II. 94, *l.* 15; B. G. XVII. 356). Tālish is the name of a tribe inhabiting Gīlān in Persia (*Farhang-i-Anjuman Ārāi, s. v.* T. R. trans. 435n). Shihābu-d-dīn Tālish wrote a history of Mīr Jumla's conquest of Āssām. A man named Ibrāhīm Beg Sārū (or Chāpūq) is mentioned in the B. N. tr. 52, 53, 66, 91, 106 and Sārū Khān Shāmlā in the *A. N.* III. 623 = Tr. III. 953.

Shāh 'Abbās II did not fix his head-quarters in the "garden of Ganj Qulī Khān", but of 'Ganj '*Alī Khān*', who was the father of 'Alī Mardān Khān and had been appointed governor of Qandahār by Shāh 'Abbās, the Great ('*A. Ṣ.* III. 82, *l.* 3 from foot; Raverty, Notes on Afghanistan, 270 note; Khwāfī Khān, text I. 692, *l.* 13).

VII. 90, *l.* 4. *The Bāshūrī and Khwāja Khizr gates he entrusted to Nūru-l-Hasan.*

The correct form is 'Māsūrī ماسوری or Māshūrī ماشوری ('A. Ṣ. III. 74, *l.* 3 and 83, *l.* 5). 'The 'Maṇḍavī' gate which is mentioned four lines lower down was the gate leading to the 'Grain Market'. 'Kambūl' is also an error for 'Qaitūl قیتول. It is said to have been a bowshot from the Māsūrī gate ('A. Ṣ. III. 163, *l.* 2 from foot).

VII. 95, *l.* 15. ***[Aurangzeb] started in the direction of Peshāwar, [from the Nīlāb], by way of the pass of Sendh-basta, which is an extremely rugged and difficult road, and without entering that city, pursued his journey by the regular stages to Kābul.***

Rennell says that "the heights of Sindia Busteh are steep, craggy and tremendous, and are to be crossed between Deenkote by those who go from the former to Cabul" (Memoir, Ed. 1793, p. 114). The range is shown lying south-west of Peshāwar and north-east of Bannu and Kohāt on the map facing p. 65.

Shahr-i-Ṣafā (*l.* 21) lies about forty miles east of Qandahār (Erskine, Memoirs of Bābur, 226 note: Mrs. Beveridge, *Bāburnāma*, 332 note).

VII. 98, *l.* 16. *The gracious monarch ...... conferred the country of Tibet in jāgīr on the above-named Muḥammad Murād as his fixed abode.*

This Muḥammad Murād was the son of Ādam Khān Tibbatī, the brother of the former ruler, Abdāl. When Baltī or Little Tibet was first annexed to the empire in the 10th year (1046–1047 H.), Ẓafar Khān, the conqueror, is said to have "left Muḥammad Murād, Abdāl's deputy, in charge of the country" (E. D. VII, 63). After the suppression of this rebellion of Mirzā Jān and the restoration of the paramount authority, the country was once more assigned or restored to him as a وطن *Waṭan* or hereditary *jāgīr*. The 'A. Ṣ. says that

ولایت تبت ...... درجاگیر او و برادرانش بطریق وطن مرحمت نمودند

III. 127, *l.* 3 from foot.

'Fixed abode' has no meaning in this connection. The country of Little Tibet was now assigned to Muḥammad Murād in *jāgīr*, just as the old Hindu principalities were, after conquest, restored to their Rājās and their descendants as hereditary *manṣabs*. Muḥammad Murād Khān was ruling in Little Tibet so late as 1076 H., the eighth year of Aurangzeb's reign (M. 'Ā. text 52, *l.* 6 from foot).

VII. 101, *l.* 7 from foot. *He also got ready 5000 mans of gunpowder, and 2500 of lead, measuring by imperial weight, and 14000 rockets.*

The author's meaning must be that this *man* was not, either the Akbarī or the Jahāngīrī, but the Shāh Jahānī. The Akbarī *man* was equivalent to about 55 lbs. *avoirdupois*, as each of its 40 *sers* was equal to about 9600 grains or 30 *dāms* of 320 grains each. Jahāngīr introduced a *ser* of his own, which had the weight of 36 *dāms* and equal to 11520 grs. The Jahāngīrī *man* was thus of about 66 lbs. Shāh Jahān raised the weight of the *ser* to 40 *dāms*, *i.e.* to about 12800 grs. The Shāh Jahānī *man* was thus equal to 12800 × 40 = 512000 grs. or about 73 pounds and this is the *man* 'as measured by imperial weight', *i.e.*

the weight introduced by the reigning emperor. The *avoirdupois* equivalents of the weights of the iron shot carried by these Gargantuan guns, which Dowson has given in round brackets, have been all *roughly* calculated at 80 lbs. to the Shāhjahānī *man*. Manucci gives the names of one hundred and seventy-seven' principal cannons' belonging to Aurangzeb and says that they "take a ball of from 20 to 120 lbs." (II. 365–6).

VII. 106, *l*. 5. *From these emporia [in Sirmūr], porters used to carry loads of snow and ice on their backs as far as Dhamrās, the name of a place situated on the river Jumna at a distance of sixteen Kos ...... There it was packed in boxes and sent down the stream on rafts to Daryāpūr, one of the dependencies of pargana Khizrābād, which is also sixteen Kos off from Dhamrās.*

I am informed by a local official that this Daryāpūr still exists and lies about ten miles distant from Būrīyā in the Ambālā district.

Dhamrās is more difficult to fix. There is a village called Dhanvās in the Paonta *tahṣīl* of Sirmūr state. The ice was collected, probably in the Churdhur range, where it is found lying even in summer and brought thence to Dhanvās. The *wāv* has been wrongly read as a *rā*.

VII. 112, *l*. 6. *This day, Kutbu-l-Mulk sent 200 more caskets full of gems and jewelled trinkets ...... to the Sultān.*

'Two hundred' is an incredible figure. It is a mistake for 'two ('A. Ṣ. III. 224, *l*. 13). Only *one* casket had been sent on the day before and only four are said to have been received afterwards (p. 113).

VII. 115, *l*. 4 from foot. *The Prince then directed them to mount two heavy guns...... on a mound situated in Kātalbī Khān's intrenchment.*

Read 'Kārṭalab Khān'. He was a Hindu named Basant Rāo (Yashwant or Vasant Rāo) who had been converted to Islam (M. U. III. 153–154) and is frequently mentioned in the *'Ālamgīrnāma* (52, *l*. 12; 62, *l*. 12; 76, *l*. 8; 128, *l*. 2 and 599, *l*. 15).

VII. 124, *l*. 15. *Mu'azzam Khān ...... joined [Aurangzeb] on the 12th Rabī'u-s-sānī. On the same day, the Prince marched on his enterprise ...... In the course of fourteen days, he reached Chāndor ...... Next day he encamped under the fort of Bīdar.*

روز نکر in the 'A. Ṣ. B. I. text III. 249, *l.* 12. But it would be impossible for any army to march from Chāndor to Bīdar—a distance of at least three hundred miles—in one day.

Aurangzeb really took one month to reach Bīdar. He arrived there only on 26th Jumādī I. 1067 H. (Sarkār, H. A. I. 264-8).

VII. 127, *l.* 15. *Mahābāt Khān left his camp in charge of Subhān Singh.*

Recte, Rājā Sujān [سجان] singh Bundela, as in the 'A. Ṣ. (text III. 253, *l.* 7). He was the eldest son of Pahāḍsingh, who was a brother of Jhujhārsingh and was made Rājā of Orchhā in 1641 A. D. He was succeeded in 1653 by Sujānsingh, who ruled upto 1672. (Luard, Gazetteer of Central India, Vol. VI. A. text 31-2; Silberrad, History of Bundelkhand in J. A. S. B. 1902). See also M. U. II. 291; *'Ālamgīrnāma*, 267, *l.* 4 from foot.

The name of the Bījāpūr commander-in-chief is wrongly spelt as 'Jān Muḥammad' in *l.* 12. It should be 'Khān (خان) Muhammad', as in the *Basātīnu-s-Salāṭīn*, 366, *l.* 4 and 'A. Ṣ III. 253, *l.* 2.

VII. 128 *l.* 16. *Suddenly, on the 1st Zī-l-Ka'da, 1067 H., the Emperor was attacked with serious illness.*

The date is wrong. The B. I. text of the 'A. Ṣ. gives it correctly as 7th Ẓī-l-ḥijja 1067 H. (III. 264, *l.* 2). See also E. D. VII. 143 and 178; *'Ālamgīrnāma*, B. I. text 27, *l.* 7.

VII. 138, *l.* 12 from foot. *The revenue of all the territories under the Emperors of Delhi, amounts to six arbs and thirty krors of dāms.*

But when the amounts given for each of the fourteen provinces are added up, the total is found to be, not six *arbs* and thirty *krors*, but six *arbs*, sixty six *krors* and ninety *lakhs*.

VII. 139, *l.* 19. *This Chief [the Rājā of Madura] had 700 wives, and they all threw themselves at the same time into the fire.*

Stories of similar holocausts are common in the literature of Indian travels. Teixeira tells us that when he was in India (*c.* 1617), on the death of the Naique of Madura, ... "400 wives of his burned themselves along with him" (*Relaciones* I. 9, *apud.* Hobson Jobson, Edit. 1903, p. 881). P. Vincenzo Maria, Procurator General of the Carmelities (*c.* 1672) puts a much greater strain on the credulity of his readers when he repeats the tale that eleven thousand women had offered themselves to the flames on the death of the Nāik of Madura.

Viaggio all' Indie Orientali, p. 322; *apud* Yule, Cathey, Ed. Cordier, II. 140 note.

VII. 147, *l.* 14. *The first four Khalifās—The Imams—The ten disciples.*

The "ten disciples" are really the عشرۂ مبشرہ the ten persons who were promised a place in Paradise by Muḥammad, *q. v.* my note in S. I. M. H. Vol. I, 702 on E. D. VIII. 358, *l.* 12.

VII. 150 footnote. *Kewal Khān in the Tazkiratu-l-Umarā.*

Read 'Kewal Rām'. He was the son of Raghunāthdās, an Agrawāl Baniya and an inhabitant of Kāsna in Bulandshahr district.

(Rieu. Catalogue, I. 339; E. D. VIII. 191). The date of composition is variously given as 1194, 1184 and even 1140 H. in manuscripts (Ethé, India Office Library Catalogue, Col. 256, Ms. No. 629).

An older collection of similar biographies of 'Men of the Time' is entitled *Zakhīratu-l-Khawānīn.*

VII. 154 last line. *He [Khwāja Ẓiyāu-d-dīn of Herāt] received the title of Malik Mardān Daulat. He was the adoptive father of Saiyid Khizr Khān, who afterwards became King of Delhī.*

The *Tārīkh-i-Mubārakshāhī* and almost all the other chronicles call him 'Marwān Daulat'. He was not the 'adoptive father', but the 'adoptive' *grand*-father of Khiẓr Khān, *i.e.* the 'adoptive father' of Malik Sulaimān, the real (or natural) father of Khiẓr Khān (text 181 last line = E. D. IV. 45).

VII. 156, *l.* 8 from foot. *Habits and manners of the Emperor Aurangzeb*

No one who compares this lengthy extract from the *Mirātu-l-'Ālam* with a similar panegyric in the *Maāṣir-i-'Ālamgīrī* can fail to see that they are identical and the same, almost word for word. It is not easy to understand why an eminent author like Musta'id Khān has ploughed in this instance with another man's heifer. Musta'id Khān informs us that he had been the *Munshī* and *Dīwān* of Bakhtāwar Khān and bestows high praise on his *Mirātu-l-'Ālam.* He describes it as "a work dear to the hearts of all who possess discernment and without exaggeration of distinguished merit in its own class".

یادگاریست مرغوب الوالالباب بی اغراق در صنف خود ممتاز

Text 253, *l.* 7 from foot.

It is quite possible that Masta'id Khān was the real and original author of this character-sketch. In a biographical notice of Bakhtāwar

Khān which is appended to a Ms. of the *Mirâtu-l-'Âlam* in the British Museum, and which Dr. Rieu believes to have been written by Musta'id Khān, it is stated that the latter "had been brought up by Bakhtāwar Khān" as a son and "had assisted his patron, during the last seventeen years of his life in the composition of the *Mirātu-l-'Ālam*" (Catalogue, I. 270; see also *Ibid.* 126). If this is true, Musta'id Khān was only taking back his own or "recalling a loan" and playing the 'honest thief'.

VII. 157, *l.* 1. *He (Aurangzeb) is a follower of the doctrines of the Imām Abū Hanīfa and establishes the five fundamental doctrines of Kanz.*

This is the *Kanza-d-Daqāyaq* کنز الدقائق "a work on Muhammadan Civil and Religious Law according to the Ḥanafite school. It was written in Arabic by Ḥāfiẓa-l-Dīna-l-Naṣafī who died about 711 H. (Loth. Catalogue of Arabic Manuscripts in the India Office Library 63b). There is a Persian translation also, of which there are five copies in the India Office Library (Ethé. I. Col. 1386, Mss 2575–2579).

VII. 157, *l.* 14. *He [Aurangzeb] gave away in alms before his accession a portion of his allowance of lawful food and clothing, and now devotes to the same purpose the income of a few villages in the district of Delhī, and the proceeds of two or three salt-producing tracts, which are appropriated to his privy purse.*

The phrase used in the parallel or counterpart passage in the *Maāṣir-i-'Ālamgīrī* is زکوة شرعی (text 525, *l.* 6 from foot) and the real meaning is that Aurangzeb had never been guilty of the sin of dodging or evading the payment of the 2½ *per cent* tax on income, which every Muslim is bound to pay, according to the religious Law. The passage is worded thus in the work of Musta'id Khān.

زکوة شرعی آنچه قبل از جلوس والا برای ماکل و ملابس خاص ... بهم
رسانیده بودند و هرچه در ایام سلطنت بسبب جدا ساختن برخی از مواضع
دار الخلافه و دو سه محل نمکسار را برای صرف خاص برآن افزوده بودند
هر سال بارباب استحقاق میدادند

VII. 158, *l.* 5. *If any of the singers and musicians becomes ashamed of his calling, he makes an allowance for him or grants him land for his maintenance.*

The word which is rendered 'ashamed' here is تائب in the corresponding passage of the *M. 'Ā.* 527, *l.* 1), which signifies that they

repented of and confessed before a Qāẓī that they had done wrong in pursuing this trade or profession. Khwāfī Khān also states that کلاونتان وقوالان ... را از سرود خوانی توبه داده بر مراتب منصب ایشان افرودند (M. L. II. 212, last line). See my note on E. D. VII. 283, *l.* 16 in S. I. M. H. Vol. I, 654.

VII. 158, *l.* 11 from foot. *All bad characters are expelled from the city of Delhī, and the same is ordered to be done in all places throughout the whole empire.*

The words in the *M. 'Ā.* are طوایف فواحش *i.e.* prostitutes and women of ill fame (text 528, *l.* 3). Khwāfī Khān says orders were promulgated against 'brothels' (خرابات خانها). See text II. 212, *l.* 5 from foot = E. D. VII. 283). Manucci tells us that "public women and dancing girls were ordered to marry or leave the realm" (Storia II. 9; see also Sarkar, H. A. III. 103).

VII. 184, *l.* 11. *It was reported to his religious Majesty ...... that the Government Officers had destroyed the temple of Bishnāth of Benāres.*

Recte, Vishvanātha, one of the epithets of Mahādeva. The shrine is also known as 'Kāshī Bisheshar' [Vishveshvara]; *q.v.* Sherring, Saved City of the Hindus, 61.

The 'Dehra Kesū Rāi' of Mathura (*l.* 1) was a shrine dedicated to Krishna, who is also known as 'Keshava Rāi'. The builder's real name was not Narasinghadeo, but Bīra (Vīra)singhadeva (Bundela). Tavernier has left a picturesque description of it (II. 240–3). Manucci says its "gilded pinnacle could be seen from Agrah" (II. 154). Bernier also refers to it as "an ancient and magnificent temple of idols" (Edit. Constable 284). It appears to have had a plinth of 25 feet and to have been 250 by 72 feet square (Keene, Guide to Agra, 95).

VII. 185, *l.* 16. *Iftikhār Khān, Khān Zāmān, ... was directed to repair to the Prince.*

He was the Khān-i-*Sāmān*, 'Steward of the Household', not 'Khān Zamān', and he is styled خان سامان in the B. I. text of the *M. 'Ā.* 101, *l.* 5. See also *Ibid.* 46, *l.* 5 from foot; 88, *l.* 12.

VII. 191, *l.* 9. *Next morning, ... the Prince Mu'izzu-d-dīn and Muhammad 'Azīm attended the darbār.*

Dowson goes out of his way to explain that he is "more commonly called Muḥammad A'ẓam. But the explanation is quite wrong and

absolutely uncalled for. The prince referred to here was Muḥammad *'Aẓīm*, the second son of Prince Muḥammad Mu'aẕẕam or Bahādur Shāh, the second son of Aurangzeb. Muḥammad A'ẕam was the third son of Aurangzeb and Muḥammad 'Aẓīm's uncle. Prince Mu'izzu-d-dīn was Muḥammad 'Aẓīm's elder brother. They were both imprisoned on the same day as their father and set at liberty only some months before his release in 1106 H. (1695 A.D.).

VII. 192, *l.* 3 from foot. *Some time after this, on the 4th of Zī-l-Ka'da (1102 H.), Mu'azzam had the honour of paying his respects to the King.*

This is stated here in such a way as to mislead the reader into supposing that the prince was released. But this was only one of several steps taken at considerable intervals, for relaxing gradually the hardships and strictness of the prince's captivity. He was restored to liberty about four years later in 1106 H.

VII 196, *l.* 15. *His [Kām Bakhsh's] father instructed him in the word of God, and his knowledge of all known works surpassed that of his brothers.*

The *Maāṣir--i-'Ālamgīrī* puts it thus:

ببرکات ارشاد و هدایت خدیو دین و دولت سعادت حفظ کلام مجید و تحصیل
کتب متداولہ نسبت بهم براداران زیاده
Text 538, *l.* 7.

"By the blessing of the teaching and guidance of the emperor, he had obtained the blessing of learning by heart the whole of the Qurān and his knowledge of the standard works [relating to literature etc.] was greater than that of his brothers".

The real meaning is that Kām Bakhsh was a Ḥāfiẓ, as Khwāfī Khān also states.

کتب متداولہ are well-known or standard works like the *Gulistān*, *Būstān*, *Sikandarnāma*, *Qaṣāid-i-Badr-i-Chāch* etc., which were then and are still read in Muḥammadan madrasas in India.

VII. 200, *l.* 10. *The Wakā'i [of Ni'mat Khān] is especially devoted to the history of the siege and conquest of Golconda.*

This praise is hardly deserved. Its 319 pages "contain a minimum of historical matter diluted in a flood of rhetorical verbiage. As a history of the siege, it is utterly inadequate, as it is truncated both ways. It begins only in the middle, and leaves off about three months before the end. All that the author does is "to describe severally the

events of the 13th, 14th and 15th Rajab and of the 17th, 18th, 25th and 29th Shaʿbān" (Rieu, Catalogue, I. 268). The siege really lasted for eight months from 24th Rabīʿ I (24th January) to 24th Ẕī-l-qaʿda 1098 H. (21st September 1687 A. D.) (*M. ʿĀ.* 288, 299).

The work is more like a literary or rhetorical *tour de force* than a sober chronicle. It bristles with wit and humour and stinging satire and justifies the author's nickname of *Hājī* (هاجی) *i.e.* the Lampooner. See also M. U. II. 689, 745.

VII. 200, *l.* 3 from foot. *Mirzā Muhammad, generally called Niʿamat Khān Hājī ...... has recorded the events of that monarch's (Aurangzeb's) reign as far as the third year.*

'That monarch' was Bahādur Shāh, Shāh 'Ālam I, and not Aurangzeb. The parenthetical gloss is wrong and the name of the father has been inserted inadvertently for that of the son. Niʿmat Khān was the author of a *Tārīkh-i-Shāh ʿĀlam Bahādur Shāh,* in which the events of the first "two years and a few months" of that emperor's reign are recorded in an "ambitious style". Dowson himself says so in his bibliographical notice of the work (E. D. VII. 568) and this is the book referred to here.

VII. 213, *l.* 2 from foot. *The Emperor Shāh Jahān, called after his death, Firdaus Makānī, was attacked with illness.*

Correctly, *Firdaus Āshiyānī*, as in the B. I. text of the *Muntakhabu-l-Lubāb*, II. 4, *l.* 7 and *M. ʿĀ.* 54, *l.* 2. *Firdaus Makānī* was the after-death title of Bābur. See also *Ibid.* 3, *l.* 4 from foot. Blochmann, *Āīn.* tr. I. genealogical table at the end of the volume.

VII. 214, *l.* 11. [*Dārā Shikoh*] *exacted from the ministers their pledges not to publish what passed in council.*

M. L. II. 4. *l.* 7. از وکلا مچلقی عدم تحریر وقائع دربار گرفتم

"He exacted from the *Wakīls*, written engagements not to report [to their employers] any events occurring at court, *i.e.* the imperial headquarters. All the princes, governors of provinces and the great Hindu Rājās retained special agents or representatives at the imperial headquarters, who followed the emperor's camp and accompanied him in his marches and progresses. Their duties were to watch and promote their masters' interests, and keep them well-informed in regard to the political situation of the hour and posted up in the personal

intrigues and rivalries at court. What Dārā did was to bind them over not to despatch any such news-letters or reports (وقایع) to their employers. He tried to impose an embargo on political intelligence. He is stated to have arrested and detained in custody Aurangzeb's 'Wakīl' and to have afterwards released him only in consequence of Shāh Jahān's intervention (*Ibid.* p. 7, *l.* 8 and 12, *l.* 3).

VII. 214, *l.* 15. *A strong adverse feeling was shown by the amīrs, zamīndārs and raiyats and also by unruly spirits.*

تفاوت تام در اطاعت امیران و زمینداران عمده و رعایای مالگذار

و مفسدپیشگان واقعم طلب راه یافت M. L. II. 4, *l.* 3 from foot.

"A great change took place in the submissive attitude of the *amīrs* and the principal *zamīndārs* (*i.e.* Hindu princes), as well as the peasants who paid land revenue and the strife-mongers who were waiting for an opportunity to do mischief".

There was no display of 'adverse feeling' against Dārā himself. The real meaning is that the report of strife and rivalry between the brothers stirred up turbulent men, among the classes as well as the masses, to repudiate their allegiance. Muḥammad Kāẓim puts it much more clearly thus in the *'Ālamgīrnāma.* He states that as no one expected that the Emperor [Shāh Jahān] would live much longer, "great disorders arose in the affairs of the state. Disaffected and rebellious men raised their heads in mutiny and strife on every side. Turbulent *raiyats* refused to pay the revenue. The seed of rebellion was sown in all directions" (Trans. in E. D. VII. 178; text 28, *l.* 4 from foot). What Khwāfī Khān wants to say is that the country was falling into internal chaos on account of the prospect of a disputed succession and civil war.

VII. 215, *l.* 2. *[Aurangzeb] made an arrangement with Sikandar 'Ādil Shāh of Bījāpur and accepted from him a promise to pay a tribute etc.*

The name of the king is given in the same way in the B. I. text II. 5, *l.* 7 from foot, but it is an error. In 1068 H. (1658 A. D.), the throne of Bījāpur was occupied by '*Alī* Ādil Shāh II, the real (or putative) father of Sikandar. The latter became king only after the death of 'Alī on Sunday, 13th Sha'bān 1083 H., 24th November 1672 A. D. *Basātīnu-s-Salāṭīn*, Ḥaidarābād Lith. 437, *l.* 13). Sikandar was then only about four years old.

VII. 216, *l.* 11. ***After receiving intelligence of Prince's (Murād Bakhsh's) departure from the Dakhin, Mahārājā Jaswant Singh was to act according to circumstances.***

The name inserted in the parenthesis must be wrong. The prince who was expected to march 'from the Dakhin' was Aurangzeb, not Murād Bakhsh, who was coming up from Gujarāt and had arranged to meet his fellow-insurgent in Mālwā. All that Khwāfī Khān says is

بعد خبر حرکت پادشاه زاده از دکن مهاراجه جسونت بتقاضاي وقت بعمل آرد

M. L. II. 7, *l.* 1.

See also *'Ālamgīrnāma*, 33, *l.* 2 and M. U. III. 97, *l.* 4 from foot.

VII. 218, *l.* 15. *Rājā Sheorāj, Commandant of Māndū.*

Correctly, 'Sheorām (Gaur) as in the M. L. text II. 13, *l.* 4; *'Ālamgīrnāma*, 57, *l.* 9. His name is given again as *Shivrām* شیورام in *Ibid.* 95, 102, 192. See also M. U. II. 263, *l.* 16.

VII. 219, *l.* 4. ***Dismay and great fear fell upon the heart of Jaswant, and he ...... turned his back upon the battle, and was content to bring upon himself everlasting infamy.***

This imputation of cowardice to the gallant Rājpūt is a libel. 'Āqil Khān Rāzī has left it on record that he fought stoutly even after he had received two wounds and urged his men to do their utmost (*Wāqi'āt-i-'Ālamgīrī*, Lith. 30, *l.* 10). Bernier also assures us that "the undaunted Rājah was beset on all sides by an over-whelming force and saved only by the affecting devotion of his Rājpūts, the greater part of whom died at his feet", (Constable's Edit. 1891, p. 39). Manucci bears witness that "the Rājah never ceased to fight most desperately until at length he saw himself left with only the smallest remnant of his force". (Storia tr. I. 259). According to other accounts also, he is said to have been dragged away from the field against his will and almost by force, after he had been seriously hurt and fallen from his horse. Khwāfī Khān has merely copied the calumny from the *'Ālamgīrnāma*, which accuses the Rāja of having brought the disgrace of flight upon himself and soiled his face with the

ننگ فرار بر خود پسندیده و نیل عار بر چهرهٔ روزگار خود کشیده

A. N. 71, last line.

VII. 223. *l.* 12. ***But Shaikh Mīr dissuaded him, and advised him to remain patient where he was.***

شیخ میر مانع آمده مصلحت نداد و گفت صبر نمایند در صورت یک گز دو
ناختم هم بعمل آمدن صلاح دولت است

M. L. II. 27, *l.* 12.

"But Shaikh Mīr stopped him and advised him not to do so and to wait patiently, as it was conducive to his own interests if 'two birds were killed with one stone'.

The expression used is a proverb borrowed from falconry. A تاخم is a partridge. The passage throws revealing light on the character of Aurangzeb's inner cabinet and shows that it contained at least one person whose Machiavellian perfidy and duplicity was even more cynical and unabashed than his own. Bāyazīd Biyāt tells a very similar story of another Mughal master of the art of government "coming up to Humāyūn very soon after the death of Mirzā Hindāl in the night attack by Kāmrān, he inquired why he was weeping. 'Because I have just heard that Mirzā Hindāl has been martyred', replied Humāyūn. 'You lament your own good', said Mun'im, 'you have one enemy less'. Upon this, his Majesty stinted his tears (H. Beveridge J. A. S. B. 1898, p. 306).

VII. 226, *l.* 13. *'Ākil Khān Khāfī ...... has described ...... the confinement of Shāh Jahān, the closing up of the waters (band namūdan-i-āb).*

As Dowson suggests that the phrase is used only figuratively in the sense of 'bringing matters to a crisis', here are 'Āqil Khān's own words which are quite clear and will not bear any such interpretation.

مبارزان مرکب شاهی روز دیگر خود را بپای جلادت بدروازهٔ خضری رسانیدند راهی که آب از آن طرف بدرون قلعه می بردند مسدود ساختند لاجرم کار محصوران بعجز گرائید و بر اضطراب انجامید

Wāqi'āt, Ed. Chaghtāī, 56, *l.* 6 from foot.

Aurangzeb's troops took possession of and closed the *Darwāza-i-Khizrī* the only gate by which water was brought from the Jumna into the fort.

'Āqil Khān is called 'Khwāfī by this author; but 'Rāzī' by others. The M. U. explains that his ancestors came from Khwāf and that he was a disciple of the saint Burhānu-d-dīn-i-Rāzī Ilāhī (II. 821, *l.* 8; 823, *l.* 5).

VII. 231, *l.* 19. *Rājā Jaswant's chief wife was a daughter of Rājā Chattar Sāl. She strongly condemned her husband's conduct and refused to sleep with him.*

Bernier repeats a more romantic and highly-coloured version of this story, but the lady is said to have been the daughter of the Rāṇā of

Udaipūr (Ed. 1684, p. 13; Ed. Constable, 1891, p. 40). The mother of Jaswant's son Ajit was an Udaipūr princess, but she could hardly have been this wrathful female, as Ajit was born about twenty-one years later in 1089 H. It is also certain that a daughter of Chhatra Sāl Hāḍā of Bundī was also one of Jaswant's wives. This piquant and scandalous tale of domestic discord appears to have circulated in the bazars with many other scandalous details and Khwāfī Khān observes that she was said by the common people to have "indulged in all sorts of bitter taunts, stinging reproaches and scornful innuendoes", which it was neither becoming nor worth while to repeat (II. 43, *l.* 14). See also Manucci I. 260.

VII. 234, *l.* **7.** *One party fled to the open country, another approached the enemy's army and set about ravaging ...... Without exaggeration, half the army had gone away to plunder or escape, and many had joined the enemy.*

جمعي روبدشت و صحرا گذاشتند و برخی خودرا برلشکر خصم رسانده در آنجا بتاراج رفتند M. L. II. 52, *l.* 13 ......

بلا اغراق زیاده از نصف لشکر بحادثه تاراج و فرارکه بیشتری رفته بفوج خصم ملحق گشتند رفت M. L. II. 53, *l.* 14.

"One body of men fled to the fields and plains and some having found their way in their flight to the forces of the enemy, were robbed or plundered *by* them"...... It may be said without exaggeration, that more than half the army had been dispersed on account of a part having been looted and a large body having fled to and got mixed up with the troops of the enemy".

متاع بتاراج رفت occurs in the M. 'Ā. 215 *l.* 1 *i.e.* his property was plundered, and Khwāfī Khān also uses the expression frequently in this sense.

در آن جنگ کارخانجات بسیار پادشاهی بتاراج رفت

M. L. II. 236, *l.* 8 from foot.

تمام فیلان و توپخانه و بهیر و ناموس و مال مردم بتاراج رفت

M. L. II. 241, *l.* 4.

See also 232, *l.* 2 from foot; 416, *l.* 14; 428, *l.* 9; 598, *l.* 3; 813, *l.* 10. Niẓāmu-d-dīn Aḥmad also writes:

و سپاهیان پسر فقیر باتمام خان و مان بتاراج رفت

M. T. B. I. text II. 372, *l.* 13.

Ibid. 413, *l.* 15. و تمام ولایت او بغارت و تاراج رفت

See also 251, *l.* 6 from foot. Compare the English phrase 'went to rack and ruin'. Khwāfī Khān uses بتاراج پرداختند (II. 754, *l.* 13) for

"they went out to plunder" and so also M. U. (I. 176, *l.* 1; II. 825). What Sarkār states is that "the camp people who hastily loaded their goods on their beasts to prepare for flight fell into the hands of the Rājputs, who were saved the trouble of packing their booty" (H. A. II. 147).

VII. 237, *l.* 10. *He [Sayyid Qāsim] went out with alacrity to meet the Prince.*

بعد بمیان آوردن عہد امان جریده برآمده بشجاع ملاقات نموده

M. L. II. 61, *l.* 11.

After having secured a promise of personal security, he came out of the fortress slightly attended [or with a very small retinue] and had an interview with Shujā'.

VII. 238, *l.* 13 from foot. *He [Dārā Shikoh] sent requisitions to the governors of Bījāpūr and Haidarābād for money and men.*

The word used in the text is حکام (62, *l.* 14) *i.e.* the *Sulṭāns* or *kings* of those realms. 'Governors' is equivocal and likely to mislead. The kings of Aḥmadnagar, Bījāpūr, Golkonda etc. were all called حکام and not سلطان by the Mughals.

VII. 239, *l.* 2. *He, at the same time, directed the Rājā to write to him about the state of affairs and send the letter by swift messengers.*

This is so obscurely and ambiguously worded that it is impossible to fix the personality, either of the Rājā who was asked to write or that of his correspondent.

وفرمودند که از جانب خود مکتوب دربن ماده باو نوشته مصحوب قاصدان سریع السیر روانه سازد

M. L. II. 64, *l.* 6.

"And he [Aurangzeb] ordered him [Jaisiṁha] to write a letter in his own name about this matter to him [Jaswantsiṁha] and despatch it by swift couriers". Aurangzeb had issued the *farmān* restoring Jaswant to favour. As Jaisimha had negotiated the treaty of peace, he was asked to write personally to Jaswant to impress upon him the wisdom of abandoning the already lost cause of Dārā and of espousing that of his victorious adversary. The *'Ālamgīrnāma* puts the matter quite clearly thus :

آن عمدهٔ راجهای دولتخواه را ...حکم همایون صادر شد که ازجانب خود
مکتوبی باو نویسد و مصحوب یکی از معتمدان خویش فرستاده اورا ازوادی
خلاف و گمراهی بمسلک قویم عبودیت و دولتخواهی رهنمون گردد و ......
ازارادهٔ پیوستن بدارا بیشکوه بازدارد

310, *l.* 9.

"And that leader of the loyal Rājās (*i.e.* Jaisimha) was commanded to write a letter on his own behalf and send it with one of his own confidential men to him (*i.e.* Jaswantsimha) with a view to conduct him from the desert of opposition and error to the straight path of obedience and loyalty and ...... dissuade him (Jaswant) from joining Dārā, the dishonoured". See also Elphinstone, History of India, 607.

VII. 240, *l.* **13.** *Next day, Aurangzeb sent Rājā Rājrūp, Zemindar of Jamūn with his infantry against the rear of a hill.*

جمون also in the M. L. II. 68, *l.* 2 from foot and the '*Ālamgīrnāma*; but he really appears to have been the Rājā of Man-Paithan and was the son of Jagatsimha, the brother of Sūrajmal, the son of Rājā Basū of the times of Akbar and Jahāngīr. He had won considerable distinction in the Balkh and Qandahar campaigns of Shāh Jahān and led with superb and reckless personal courage a contingent of troops trained in mountain warfare. He is frequently mentioned as the Rājā of Man and Paithan in B. N. II. 127, 237, 262, 269, 546, 702; Khwāfī Khān I. 618-9, 650, 711, 720; M. U. II. 277-281.

The '*Ālamgīrnāma* is responsible for confounding 'Mau' with 'Jammū' and has misled all subsequent writers, including Sir J. N. Sarkār.

VII. 241, *l.* **12.** *The second year of the reign commenced on the 4th Ramazān 1069 A. H.*

The M. L. has 24th Ramaẓān (II. 76, *l.* 10). On p. 253 of the volume also, Dowson states that the third year began on the 24th Ramaẓān, but what Khwāfī Khān really says is that the *Jashns* or festivals of the 2nd and 3rd years of accession جشن سال جلوس (II. 76, *l.* 6; 107, *l.* 10) were celebrated on 24th Ramaẓān in 1069 and 1070 H. On p. 266 Dowson makes the author say that the festival of the 4th year was held on the 1st of *Shawwāl*, 1072 H. (text II. 154, *l.* 4 from foot). All this is confusing, confused and inconsistent.

As Aurangzeb had ascended the throne informally on 1st Ẕī-l-qa'da 1068 H., he was crowned again with the customary pomp and ceremonial after the final defeat and flight of Dārā, in 1069 H. The day chosen by the astrologers for this grand event was however the 24th of Ramaẓān and in the following year also, Aurangzeb celebrated the anniversary of his coronation on the 24th of Ramaẓān. But it had been proclaimed by an imperial decree issued in the 2nd year, that the official date of accession was to be the 1st of Ramaẓān 1068 H. (*M. 'Ā.*

25, *l.* 2). The author of the *'Ālamgīrnāma* reckons the *julūs* years from the 1st of Ramaẓān and expressly informs his readers that "one year and twenty-four days of the reign of the emperor had expired on the day of his second coronation" (B. I. text 389, *l.* 5). He states in another passage that the third year of the reign began on Tuesday, 1st of Ramaẓān, 1070 H. (*Ib.* 480, *l.* 8).

The reason for choosing Ramaẓān was that it was a holy month, and its first day was especially preferred, because Aurangzeb's crossing of the Chambal on that auspicious day had been followed by a series of victories and triumphs. The reason for ordering the celebration of the feast of *jashn* of the coronation in *subsequent* years to commence only on the 1st of Shawwāl was that Ramaẓān should be observed as a time of fasting and prayer and not of merry-making. As the *'Id-i-fitr* falls on the 1st of Shawwāl, immediately after the termination of the fast, the two *'Ids* (festivals) were assimilated and combined into one. In a word, the initial day of the *julūs* or regnal year was the 1st of Ramaẓān, but the *jashn* or festival in its honour was celebrated usually on and after the 1st of Shawwāl.

VII. 252, *l.* 1. *After discharging the observances of religion, it is represented to your most august presence.*

بعد ادای وظائف عقیدت بعرض اقدس میرساند

M. L. II. 104, *l.* 9 from foot.

This phrase is only a conventional locution similar to the old English expression 'my most dutiful respects', 'my most humble duty' etc. It has nothing to do with any 'observances of religion', and is a *bienseance*, a form of decorum, or stereotyped formula prefixed to letters addressed to parents etc. according to the rules of *Inshā*. It has been, not inappropriately, described as the art of telling insignificant things in an involved and rhetorical style (Erskine: Bābur's Memoirs). There are hundreds of such forms in every work on the subject.

The '17th inst.' mentioned on p. 253, *l.* 9 must be the 17th Rabī' II 1069 H. on which Aurangzeb marched from Dehlī against Shujā' (Kh. Kh. II. 47, *l.* 12). This letter must have been written after that date.

VII. 255, *l.* 12. *It is said that one of the ancestors of Sivājī from whom he received the name of Bhoslah, dwelt in the country of the Rāṇā ...... The origin of the name Bhoslah ...... is from the Hindī word 'Ghoslah', meaning place, or a very small and narrow place.*

The real origin of the surname is unknown. It is said in some of the old chronicles to have been derived from an ancestor who is supposed to have been named Bhosājī or assumed the title of 'Bhosavanta Bhosle'. Others trace it to a place called Bhosī or Bhosavat which is believed to have been near Chitore (Keḷuskar, life of Shivājī, Eng. trans. 4–5 and note). But these eponymous derivations are of very small historical value and the supposed descent of Shivājī from the Rāṇās of Chitore is now all but universally discredited (Sarkar, Shivājī, 209–210).

It may be therefore permissible to invite attention to the fact that there appears to have existed a village called 'Bhosla' in the neighbourhood of Vaijāpūr and Lāsūr about 1630 A. D. The place must have been of some importance at the time, as it is mentioned twice in the *Bādshāhnāma* and the *'Amal-i-Ṣāliḥ*, in connection with the pursuit of Khānjahān Lodī (E. D. VII. 15). Vaijāpūr and Lāsūr are in close proximity to Verūḷ (or Ellora) which is known to have been the original home of Mālojī, the grandfather of Shivājī. Verūḷ lies about sixteen miles north-west of, and Lāsūr twenty one miles west of Aurangābād. Vaijāpūr is situated about five miles south of Lāsūr (Constable. Pl. 31 C. b). Unfortunately, I have failed to trace any village called 'Bhosla' in the neighbourhood. The name of the place is clearly spelt بهوسلہ in *Bād. Nām.* I. i. 327, *l.* 8 and 328, *l.* 11 and *'Amal-i-Ṣāliḥ*, I. 392, *l.* 7.

VII. 256, *l.* 15. *Mullā Ahmad .... who was descended from an Arab immigrant, held three parganas in the country.*

He was a Nāita or Nawāit (*M. 'Ā.* 52, *l.* 4), a "name given to Muhammadans of mixed race in the Konkaṇ and South Canara." They are said to be descended from persons "who fled from the Persian Gulf about the end of the 7th century to escape the persecution" of Hajjāj bin Yūsuf. The Madras Glossary derives the word from the Pers. *Nāitī*, from *Nāit*, the name of an *Arab* clan, while others think that it is a Konkaṇī word meaning 'new convert' (Yule and Burnell, Hobson Jobson, Ed. Crooke, 620). He is called نایتہ in the *'Ālamgīrnāma* (57?, *l.* 15). The M. U. says نوایت is only another and corrupt way of spelling and pronouncing نوآمد 'newly come'. They were originally شرفای عرب Arab nobles (III. 562, *l.* 9).

VII. 257, *l.* 2 from foot. *Evil days fell upon the kingdom of Bījāpūr in the time of Sikandar 'Alī 'Ādil Khān, the Second.*

There is some confusion here. Muḥammad 'Ādil Shāh died in 1656 A. D., and was succeeded by '*Alī* 'Ādil Shāh II. 'Alī died in 1672 A. D. and Sikandar was the successor of 'Alī. Delete 'Sikandar'. Khwāfī Khān, is speaking of events preceding the murder of Afẓal Khān, which took place in 1070 H. (1659 A. D.). The error occurs again in *l.* 14, p. 258 and there also the name of the reigning king should be read as 'Alī 'Ādil Khān. 'Alī 'Ādil Shāh himself was only eighteen years old when he was placed on the throne on 6th Muḥarram 1067 H. = 15th October 1656 A. D. (*Basātīnu-s-Salāṭīn* 363 last line).

The "'Adil Khān of Bījāpūr" who is said on p. 256, *l.* 4 from foot, to have "suffered for a long time" from illness, was Muḥammad 'Ādil Shāh who had been struck down by paralysis in 1646 A. D. and as he never recovered from it until his death ten years later, "great confusion naturally arose in his territory". '*Ālamgīrnāma* 576, *ll.* 9–12.

VII. 262, *l.* 13 from foot. *After the siege had lasted fifty or sixty days, a bastion .... was blown up.*

پنجاه و شش روز 'fifty-six days' in the M. L. text, II. 121, *l.* 6. The siege began on 22nd Shawwāl 1070 H. = 21st June 1660 A. D. (O. S.) and the mine which blew up the bastion was fired on 17th Ẕī-l-ḥijja 1070 H. = 14th August 1660 A. D. ('*Ālamgīrnāma*, 585, *l.* 13; 587, *l.* 1). Dowson has wrongly read شصت for شش

VII. 263, *l.* 4. *The men in the citadel being reduced to extremity sent Rāo Bhāo Sing to make terms and then surrendered.*

و چون در حصار ارک نیز کار بر محصوران تنگ گردید راؤ بهاو سنگ را شفیع خود ساختہ قلعہ را بہ بندہای پادشاهی واگذاشتہ. M. L. II. 122, *l.* 3.

"They made Rāo Bhāosingh their intercessor and surrendered the fortress." See also '*Ālamgīrnāma*, 588, *l.* 13.

He was Bhāosingh Hāḍā, the brother-in-law of Mahārājā Jaswantsingh, *q. v.* Sarkar, Shivājī, 103. He was the brother of the irate virago who according to Khwāfī Khān's version of the tale refused to give her conjugal right to the Mahārājā because he had tarnished his name by flying from the field of Samūgarh.

VII. 263, *l.* 8. *After a time, he [the Amīru-l-umarā Shāyista Khān] gave the name of Islāmābād to Chākna, and called Ja'far Khān from Mālwā to his assistance.*

و بعد عرض چاکنہ را باسلام آباد موسوم ساختہ جعفرخان را کہ در مالوا بود بمدد امیرالامرا مامور فرمودند

M. L. II. 122, *l.* 8.

"After the submission of a report of the conquest at court, Aurangzeb gave to Chākna the new name or designation of Islāmābād and ordered Ja'far Khān who was in Mālwā to go as an auxiliary of the Amīru-l-umarā".

Both these orders emanated from the emperor himself, not from Shāyista Khān. The latter had no authority to transfer Ja'far Khān. See '*Ālamgīrnāma* 588, last line, which explicitly states that:

قلعہ مذکور بموجب حکم اشرف با سلام آباد موسوم گشت

As regards Ja'far Khān also it is stated there that the

یرلیغ جہان مطاع بجعفر خان صوبہ دار مالوہ صادر شد ...... کہ برای کومک امیر الامرا بدکن شتابد

Ibid 590, *l.* 6.

VII. 267, *l.* 10. *After the second watch of the night, before the world was asleep.*

But what the text says is

بعد دو پاس شب کہ مور و ماهی در خواب بودند M. L. II. 156, *l.* 4.

"After two watches of the night, when all creation (lit. the ants and fishes) had gone to sleep." It was *after* midnight.

There is nothing corresponding to 'Mughal woman' (*l.* 6) in the text. Dowson has misunderstood the word مغلانی which is used only as the plural form of مغل. Murād Bakhsh had a partiality for retaining in his service Persians, Uzbegs, Badakhshīs, etc. who were all called 'Mughals' by the people in this country. What Khwāfī Khān really says is that Murād Bakhsh used to give away half of his food-allowance to

بجمعی از مغلان کہ در پای حصار قلعہ فقیر شدہ نشستہ بودند و مغلانی کہ مسافر وارد می شدند

M. L. II. 155, *l.* 2 from foot.

"a body of Mughals who had become *fakīrs* and sat down at the foot of the castle and to other Mughals who arrived there as travellers (or wayfarers)".

Budāūnī uses the plural form just in the same way.

سلطان فیروز در اول جلوس حکمی کہ کرد این بود کہ مغلانی کہ دست برد بمردم لشکر مینمودند جدا ازاردو فرود آیند

M. T. I. 243, *l.* 2.

"Sulṭān Fīrūz at the outset of his reign issued the order that the *Mughals* who had obtained influence over the soldiery should be brought apart from the camp" (Tr. Ranking, I. 323).

So we read in the Ṭ. A.:

راجپوتانی که در آن قلعه بودند که از خوف صدمات توپخانه ...... راه فرار پیش گرفتند

B. I. text II. 257 last line; see also *Ibid* 323, *l.* 13.

و سپاهیانی که در آن مجلس حاضر بودند بتخصیص باباخان و قاقشالان دیگر قرار حرام نمکی بخود دادند

Ibid 349, *l.* 2.

مغلانی does mean 'Mughal woman' in Hindustānī, but here it is only the plural of مغلان with the ی suffixed as a demonstrative particle. Compare also the account in H. A. II. 98 where there is no mention of any Mughal woman. Khwāfī Khān gives here only the month and year of Murād Bakhsh's execution. The *'Amal-i-Ṣaliḥ* records the exact date as the 21st Rabī' II, 1072 H.

VII. 270, *l.* 7 from foot. *A man of importance who had a house behind the palace of the Amīru-l-umrā heard the outcry.*

یکی از جماعه داران عمده که عقب محل امیرالامرا خانه داشت

M. L. II. 174, *l.* 4 from foot.

"He was one of the principal *jamādārs*", *i.e.* captains of companies or recruiting officers and muster-masters (H. A. IV. 50). The word is frequently used in this sense by Khwāfī Khān elsewhere *q. v.* E. D. VII. 500 = text II. 897.

It is not correct to speak of the two females who were "attacked" as "two of the Amīrs' women". They were his حرم خاص or "favourite wives" (II. 175, *l.* 2). As a matter of fact, "six of his wives and slave-girls were killed and eight other women were wounded" (Sarkar, H. A. IV. 51).

VII. 271, *l.* 14. *The Amīru-l-umarā was recalled, but a subsequent order sent him to be sūbadār of Bengal.*

و امیرالامرا طلب حضور گردید باز حکم فرمودند ملازمت نا نموده بصوبهٔ بنگاله برود

M. L. II. 175, *l.* 12.

"The Amīru-l-umrā was commanded [at first] to come to court, but afterwards, he was ordered to go forthwith to the *Ṣūba* of Bengal, without making his obeisance".

The deprivation of this coveted honour was tantamount to a severe censure or token of displeasure for every man to see and remember. The transportation to Bengal, which was universally regarded then as 'a hell full of good things' or as a penal province, on account of its malarial climate, was another and much more grievous punishment.

VII. 277, *l.* 2 from foot. *The trees and lofty buildings near the fortress were destroyed, spikes were fixed in the ground.*

The six last words have no sense in this context.

و اشجار ثمردار و سایه‌دار و عمارتهای عالی متصل قلعه را بریدند و مسمار نمودند

M. L. II. 194, *l.* 13.

"The trees were cut down and the buildings were demolished". The primary meaning of مسمار is 'nail' or 'spike' but مسمار ساختن is very frequently used in connection with the pulling down, demolition or razing to the ground of idol-temples and other edifices. Khwāfī Khān writes : مسمار نمودن مساجد و مقابر II. 651, *l.* 1; بتخانهای بسیار مسمار نمود II. 761, *l.* 13. See also 206, *l.* 13, 264, *l.* 3 and 316, *l.* 5 from foot.

Sarkar says that "every building had been razed to the ground and every tree cut down, so that not a green branch or shade-giving wall was left standing to afford shelter to the invaders" (H. A. IV. 114).

VII. 278, *l.* 15. *The Rājā [Jaisiṁha of Amber] called Sivājī to him and treated him very courteously.*

باز راجه بتدبیر بسیار استمالت نموده نزد خود طلبید

M. L. II. 195, *l.* 7 from foot.

It was Netājī who had deserted and gone over or been seduced by the enemy and it was he who was induced to come back, and not Shivājī (*'Ālamgīrnāma* 1009, *l.* 7; Sarkar, Shivājī, p. 137). He is said to have received a douceur of four lakhs of *hun* from the Bījāpūrīs and the counter bribe offered by Jaisiṁha was the rank of five thousand, a big *jāgīr* and 38000 Rs. in cash (Sarkar H. A. IV. 117).

VII. 282, *l.* 17. *Nevertheless, some competent persons (did write) and particularly Musta'id Khān who secretly wrote an abridged account of the campaign in the Dakhin, simply detailing the conquests of the countries and the forts, without alluding at all to the misfortunes of the campaign.*

This reference to the work of Musta'id Khān is interesting; but it may be doubted whether what Khwāfī Khān saw was identical with the redaction of the *Maāṣir-i-'Ālamgīrī*, which we possess. In the first place, he asserts that the book was written secretly, and in the second, he declares that it was only "a short or summary [مجملا] account of Aurangzeb's campaign in the Dakhin" and his conquests of Mahratta forts. But the existing recension of the *M.'Ā.* was completed not in Aurangzeb's life-time, but three years after his death, at the suggestion of 'Ināyatullāh Khān, the Vazīr of Bahādur Shāh I. It is not a 'bald narrative of the emperor's Dekkan conquests'. Nor does it pass over

entirely "the misfortunes of the campaign". They are often described at great length. Khwāfī Khān complains of having never seen nor obtained any history containing an account of the last forty years of the emperor's reign and he admits that he has not been able to relate the events of the period between the eleventh and the twenty-first year "in the order in which they occurred". Now no one who had read the *M.'Ā.* with any attention could have asserted any such thing, as it is a complete chronicle, year by year, and often month by month, of the leading events of the whole reign, including those of the second decade. Indeed, Khwāfī Khān would have escaped many a demonstrable error, if he had the benefit of Musta'id Khān's inside knowledge and meticulously documented information. Khwāfī Khān must have seen only the first draft or perhaps only a fragmentary portion of the work and not the revised and expanded recension. There is a direct quotation from Musta'id Khān's chronicle in the latter part of Khwāfī Khān's account of Aurangzeb's reign. It relates to the capture of the fort of Tornā (or Futūḥa-l-ghaib). Its purport is that this was the only Mahratta fort which was taken by the sword or sheer force of arms and without any *pourparlers* or negotiations.

بي رسل و رسائل بضرب شمشير و يورش جانبازي بتسخير در آمد ٭

M. L. II. 523, *l.* 7 from foot.

But no such remark or observation *in those words* is found in the published text of the *M. 'Ā.* (486–488).

VII. 284, *l.* 11. *Besides the nobles in attendance at the court, hundreds of thousands of men and women of all classes used to collect under the jharokha and offer their blessings and praises.*

So also in the text چندين آدم از زن و مرد (II. 213, *l.* 13), but there must be not a little exaggeration and it would be more in accordance with fact to delete 'hundrds of' and cut down the figure to 'thousands'. The 'Darshanīyas' were a small body of disreputable mendicants and vagabonds.

VII. 286, *l.* 1. *Having thus provided for the care of his boy, he [Shivājī] continued his flight.*

The B. I. text differs greatly here thus:

و برهمن معتمد قديمي خود را كه بسبب و كيكس را بهم رسانده بود باخرج
چند ساله همراه سنبها گذاشته راه بنارس اختيار نمود M. L. II. 219, *l.* 1.

"And after leaving Sambhā with a Brāhmaṇ who was one of his old confidants and through whom he had secured the services of Kabkalas, and giving him [the Brāhmaṇ] money enough for several years' expenditure, he [Shivājī] himself took the road to Benāres [from Allāhābād].

Dowson is wrong in making Khwāfī Khān say that the boy was handed over at Benāres or that Kabkalas "happened at that time to be at Benāres". There is nothing corresponding to the latter statement in the B. I. text. Khwāfī Khān asserts that the parting between the father and the son took place at Allāhābād, but it seems to have really taken place at Mathurā (Sarkar, Shivājī, 153; Kincaid I. 221; M. U. II. 347).

VII. 287, footnote. *This [the second sack of Sūrat] was in the thirteenth year of the reign, 1081 A. H. (1671 A. D.), according to the Maāṣir-i-ʿĀlamgīrī.*

The Christian year is wrongly given by Dowson. The *M. ʿĀ.* gives the Hijra date as 27th Jumāda-l-awwal 1081 (106, *l.* 4 from foot). This was equivalent, according to the book-rule, to 2nd October 1670 A. D. (O. S.). The date given in the English records is 3rd October (O. S.) or 13th October 1670 A. D. (N. S.) [Grant Duff, H. M., reprint 1873, p. 110; Hunter, History of British India, II. 215; Bombay Gazetteer, II. (Surat), 89].

VII. 290, *l.* 13. *Khān Jahān also took measures to thwart the designs of Sivājī. He got together some ships at the fortress (of Sūrat) and began the rebuilding which had been ordered.*

According to the text, it was not Khān Jahān who did this, but the Sīdīs.

و سیدی سنبل از رسیدن منصب و خلعت و زر نقد مستظهر و مفتخر گشته کمر
همت بر دفع شر سیواي مردود بسته کشتیهای پای قلعه که تعمیر طلب شده
بودند شروع بمرمت نمودن آن ساختند

M. L. II. 225, *l.* 6.

"And Sīdī Sambal ...... girded up his loins to repel the evil designs of the accursed Sivājī and commenced repairing the ships at the fort (of Dandā Rājapūrī) which stood in need of reconditioning". The whole passage has been misunderstood and there is no reference to Sūrat or the "rebuilding" of its walls in the text.

VII. 292, *l.* 5 from foot. *A report reached Sivājī that his son Sambhā... was dead.*

This is inaccurate and misleading. What Khwāfī Khān really says is that Shivājī himself wrote or faked a letter in the name of Kabkalas to inform him of the death of Sambhājī and spread the news.

سیوا خطي از زبان کبکلس مشتمل برخبر مردن سنبها نوشته شهرت فوت پسر
داده بماتم او نشست

M. L. II. 229, *l.* 2.

He also states that after Sambhājī's safe arrival, Shivājī justified the ruse on the ground that if he had not thrown Aurangzeb off the scent and misled him, with a view to the slackening of the pursuit, his son would not have been able to evade capture and return to the Dekkan from "a distance of two months' journey" از مسافت دو ماهه (*Ibid. l.* 11).

It was not "a report which reached Sivājī". The yarn was a product of his own manufacture. He pretended to believe in it and did everything to disseminate it. The funeral ceremonies and the sham threat of Sambhājī's wife to become a *Satī* were parts of a lying propaganda to lull Aurangzeb into a false security.

VII. 293, *l.* 12 from foot. *In the sixteenth year of the reign, corresponding to 1083 A. H. (1673 A. D.), Khān Jahān fought a battle with Bahlol, the Bījāpūr general, near the town of Mālkher.*

The engagement in which Islām Khān Rūmī was killed really took place in the 19th year, on 11th Rabī' II, 1087 H. (1676 A. D.), not in the 16th (1083 H.) according to Musta'id Khān (*M. 'Ā.* 151, *l.* 10; Sarkar, H. A. IV. 142). The site of the battle is said to have been about thirty miles to the north of Bījāpūr somewhere near Iṇḍī. The defeat of Dilīr Khān, which is mentioned in the last line of this page, was a different affair altogether. It took place near Mālkheḍ in the twenty-first year, 1088 H. (1677 A. D.), (M. 'Ā. 165, *l.* 12; H. A. IV 147–8). Mālkheḍ lies at about seventy miles north-east of Bījāpūr.

VII. 293, *l.* 1. *An order was issued that every article belonging to Musulmāns, the price of which was not large, should pass free.*

هر جنسی کم قیمت آن از حد نصاب تجاوز نکرده باشد بمسلمانان محصول آن معاف شناختم

M. L. II. 229, *l.* 3 from foot.

"Every article, the price of which did not exceed a 'niṣāb' and belonged to Musalmāns was to be exempt from duty".

The 'niṣāb' was a legal term for two hundred dirhams and Aurangzeb fixed its value in Indian money by an administrative order at about 55 rupees.

The *farmāns* relating to this matter are reproduced textually in the *Mirāt-i-Aḥmadī* and were issued in the 8th and 10th years and not in or after the 11th (1079 H.), as Khwāfī Khān asserts. He has also upset the order in which the commands were promulgated. The order for

levying 2½ p. c. from Musalmans and 5 p. c. from Hindus was dated in 1075 H. That exempting Musalman goods altogether came after it in 1077 H. (*Mirāt-i-Aḥmadī*, 272, *l.* 11; 280, *l.* 6). The invidious and discriminatory exemption was abolished only in 1092 H. (*Ibid.* 315, *l.* 7) and it was only after fifteen years that Aurangzeb realised its inherent inequity, demoralising character and detrimental reactions on his revenue. The fraudulent practices of his coreligionists compelled him to retrace his steps.

VII. 294, last line. *Their numbers went on increasing and information was sent to Kār-talab Khān faujdār of Nārnaul.*

According to the M. 'Ā. (text 115, *l.* 10), the *faujdār* who was routed by the Satnāmīs was named Ṭāhir Khān and he was not killed, but came to court after his flight. Kārṭalab Khān was appointed *Faujdār* of Nārnol only some time later and after the suppression of the Satnāmī revolt, which appears to have petered out in a few months (M. 'Ā. 124, *l.* 4). Khwāfī Khān's account of the tumult of these fanatical boors is more melodramatic than factual. He has glibly repeated the alarmist rumours woven in the bazars. The popular imagination was in a state of ferment and had conjured up tales of witches and victories won by sorcery and demoniac agency. Manucci (II. 167) also has exaggerated the importance of the émeute and succumbed to his craze for the supernatural.

VII. 297, *l.* 8 from foot. *The brave and active chiefs who might have stopped or overtaken them [the Rāṇīs], were keeping guard over the tents in which the pretended children of the Rāja were.*

ویک دو سردار معتمد را بافوج شایستهٔ تهور پیشهٔ جانبازکہ اگر زود خبر یابند
و قصد تعاقب نمایند شرط جانفشانی بتقدیم رسانده یک دوپہر سد راه توانند
M. L. II. 259, last line. گردید نزد خیمهٔ پسرهای جعلی راجہ نگاه داشتند

"And they posted near the tents of the pretended sons of the Rāja, one or two trustworthy chiefs and a body of well-armed and self-sacrificing bravos, with a view to bar the road and stay the pursuit for one or two watches, even at the risk of their own lives, in case the news of the flight reached [Aurangzeb] very early and attempts were made to persue the fugitives immediately".

The plan was to fight a delaying action first in Dehlī itself round the residence of the Rāṇīs after their flight. The object was to enable them, in the meanwhile to get a start. The leaders of the troops who

accompanied the fugitives were afterwards to turn round and fight rear-guard actions with the pursuers at two or three points of vantage to gain more time.

VII. 298, *l.* 4. ***The flight of the rāṇīs was not clearly proved. Some men, who wished to show their zeal, and to cover their negligence in the matter, asserted that the boys had escaped, and that the Wazīr had sent out a force to secure them.***

اما مزاج بعضی اهل غرض کہ خواستند حسن تردد وعدم غفلت خود برکرسي
نشانند در اثبات گذاشتہ برفتن پسران بمرتبۂ مصربودند کہ رای میر [و] وزیر
برد ستگیر گردیدن پسران راجہ قرار گرفت

M. L. II. 260, *l.* 11.

"But some men ...... adhered so obstinately to their statements about the escape of the boys, that all opinions (lit. the opinion of the emperor and also of the *Wazīr*) were agreed as to the certainty of the capture of the sons of the Rājā".

Khwāfī Khān uses the expression in this sense elsewhere also.

جمعی کہ براي نفس پروری خود یا برای خوشنودي میر و وزیر ظلم و تعدی
بر رعایا می نمایند

M. L. II. 376, *l.* 9 from foot.

اول علت غائي مادہ نزاع کہ مابین میر و وزیر بمیان آمد این بود

Ibid. 729, *l.* 13.

This is said in connection with the first quarrel between Farrukh Sīyar and the Saiyids and he writes later that

اخبار بحال نماندن آشتی میان میر و وزیر انتشار یافت

M. L. II. 794, *l.* 8.

In all these passages, the phrase can have only one meaning, *viz.* the sovereign and his ministers or counsellors. The author of the *Maāṣiru-l-Umarā* also writes thus about the catastrophic manner in which Jahāndār Shāh and his Vazīr were hurled down from the seat of power.

قضا را دغلباز فلک بازي گویان میر و وزیر را از بازی خانہ حکم رانی
دزد آسا بمعدم سیاست کنید و خصل سلطنت و شغل وزارت را بحریفان
دیگر ارزاني داشت

M. U. II. 506, *l.* 17.

Here میر و وزیر can only signify 'the emperor and his minister'.

VII. 298, *l.* 17. ***At the beginning of Zī-l-hijja of the twenty-second year of the reign, Aurangzeb started from Ajmer ...... His journey to Ajmer and back occupied seven months and twenty days.***

Aurangzeb started *for*, not from, Ajmer on the 16th of Ẓī-l-ḥijja 1089 H. (M. 'Ā. 172, *l.* 6), corresponding to 9th January, 1679 A. D. He

was back in Dehlī on 1st Rabī' I. 1090 H. (*Ibid.* 174, *l.* 12) = 2nd April 1679 A. D. (H. A. III. 370–1). He was away on this occasion for less than three months and not seven, as Khwāfī Khān avers. He left Dehlī again *for* Ajmer towards the end of the same *julūs* [not Hijra] year on the 7th of Sha'bān (*M. 'Ā.* 180, *l.* 9; H. A. 111. 379). Khwāfī Khān has rolled up the two expeditions into one and confused the chronology. Aurangzeb never returned to Dehlī after marching to Ajmer for the second time in Sha'bān 1090 H.

VII. 299, *l.* 20. *When Prince Muhammad Mu'azzam arrived at Ujjain, he was directed to march against the lake of Anā-sāgar, which belonged to the Rānā, and was about eighty Kos from Ajmer.*

Khwāfī Khān has made some mistake in regard to the name of the lake. 'Anā Sāgar' is a lake only three or four miles distant from Ajmer. This lake must have been in Udaipūr or near it, and it is possible that the name, as it was written by Khwāfī Khān, was *Rānā* sāgar and that what he meant was the 'Rājasamudra' lake, which was constructed at great expense by the reigning Rāṇā, Rājasiṁha. It is true that the Rājasamudra is never called Rāṇā-sāgar now by any one, but Khwāfī Khān may have spoken of it as the 'Rāṇā's lake', because he could not recall its specific designation at the time of writing. The 'Rāṇā's lake' تالاب رانا is mentioned in the *M. 'Ā.* also, and it is recorded there that the news of the safe arrival of prince Muḥammad Mu'aẓẓam at the *Tālāb-i-Rāṇā* reached Aurangzeb on the 2nd of Muḥarram 1092 H. i.e. twenty-fourth year (Text 200, *l.* 1). The right reading must be رانا ساگر. Aurangzeb is stated to have personally visited a lake called 'Udaya-sāgar' on the 2nd of Muḥarram 1092 H. while he was encamped near Udaipūr and to have given orders for the demolition of three temples which stood on its banks (M. 'Ā. 188, last line). Mr. Irvine speaks of this reservoir as '*Rāṇā* sāgar' in his notes (Storia II. 240. 241), but the substitution of 'Rāṇā' for 'Udaya' appears to be unwarranted.

Manucci who was in the princes' train at the time describes it thus: "We encamped at a great lake called 'Rāṇā sāgar' that is to say 'made by the Rāṇā'. Its wall on one side is formed by the mountains; on the other side are stairs of handsome hewn stone. The lake was so large that it took more than eight hours to go round it, and I say this because I proved it myself with my horse. In the middle of the lake, are three large boats, ... which are used by the Rāṇā for his own amusement" (Storia II. 239).

VII. 302, *l.* 11. ***Leaving his ladies and attendants behind under protection, he (Muḥammad Mu'aẓẓam) set off with all speed.***

M. L. II. 266, *l.* 15. بهیر و خدمهٔ محل را هما نجا بحافظ حقیقی سپرده

"He left his baggage and the ladies of the palace under the protection of the True Preserver, *i.e.* God".

VII. 302, *l.* 19. *The expressions of some of Prince Muhammad Mu'aẓẓam's thoughtless companions roused Aurangzeb's caution and prudence.*

باظهار بعضی هواخواهان از طرف محمد معظم نیز درعالم احتیاط و دوربینی وسواس بخاطر پادشاه راه یافت

M. L. II. 266, *l.* 3 from foot.

"In pursuance of revelations (*i.e.* secret reports) made by several devoted adherents [of Aurangzeb], suspicions of Muḥammad Mu'aẓẓam also found their way into the heart of the emperor, which had their origin in his cautiousness and foresight".

The translation conveys to the reader an impression very different from that intended by the author. Dowson has misunderstood the words از طرف محمد معظم. These هواخواهان were Aurangzeb's secret counsellors, the members of his innermost conclave, who were always advising him to be on his guard against and beware of the treachery and intrigues of his own sons.

VII. 303, *l.* 12 from foot. *It was now stated ...... that Tahawwur Khān had come...... to make known his [Muḥammad Akbar's] pretensions and demands.*

تهور خان باظهار تهوری و ارادهٔ فاسد برخصت و مصلحت و فرمودهٔ محمد اکبر خود را رسانیده

M. L. II. 268, *l.* 12.

"Tahawwur Khān had arrived with the permission and advice and by the order of Muḥammad Akbar to make a display of his foolhardy courage and traitorous designs" (*i.e.* his intention to assassinate Aurangzeb). ارادهٔ فاسد means 'high treason, murder of the emperor,' not 'pretensions and demands'. Manucci asserts that he intended to assassinate Aurangzeb (*Storia* II. 247).

VII. 304, *l.* 7. *'Ināyat Khān, his father-in-law, who was a private secretary of Aurangzeb.*

M. L. II. 269, *l.* 1. که دیوان تن بود

He was the *Dīwān* of the *Tankhwāh*, *q.v.* my note in S. I. M. H. Vol. I. 694.

VII. 304, *l.* 12. *It was commonly reported that Aurangzeb craftily wrote a letter to prince Muḥammad Akbar, and contrived that it should fall into the hands of the Rājpūts ...... Such is the story I have heard, but not from any trustworthy person.*

It is strange that this story should be repeated as a fact in so many of our historical text-books, though its original narrator emphatically declares that he had "not heard it from any trustworthy person".

It is an ancient and somewhat hackneyed ruse and Sulṭān Ibrāhīm Ghaznavī is said to have employed it in his war against Malik Shāh Seljūqī. Sher Shāh also is said to have resorted to a similar stratagem to extricate himself from a most difficult situation during his invasion of Jodhpūr (E. D. IV. 405). Aurangzeb had deceived and double-crossed everybody and his black record was always engendering canards illustrative of his subtle and complicated cunning.

"Many persons have told me", Bernier writes, "that all this strange conduct of Sultan Mahmad was planned by Aurangzeb, who was very willing to see his son engaged in any enterprise however hazardous, which had for its object the ruin of Sultan Sujah. Whatever the event might be, he hoped to gain some specious pretext for having Sultan Mahmad conveyed to a place of security" (Travels. Ed. Constable, 1891, p. 83). He also informs us that "many people were convinced that Seva-Gi did not escape without the connwance of Aurangzeb himself" (*Ib.* 191). Manucci in his characteristically irresponsible manner talks of Aurangzeb having instigated prince Mu'aẓẓam also to raise a mock rebellion "for the double purpose of finding out his secret enemies and of discrediting his son, in case that prince should ever be disposed to rebel in earnest" (*Storia* II. 162, 163, 166). See also Grant Duff, reprint p. 99.

Elphinstone justly remarks in connection with another canard of the same sort that it "is not the only occasion on which the wily character of Aurangzeb has led to his being suspected of deep schemes and intrigues in which he never was engaged" (H. I. Ed. 1866, p. 632 note). This story of the forged letters is, most probably, a wise-crack which had its origin, not in fact, but in the fertile imagination of some busy rumour-monger.

VII. 306, *l.* 7. *He [Sambhājī] raised the standard of rebellion, and on the 20th of Muharram, in the 23rd year of the reign, corresponding with 1091 A. H. (15th February, 1680), he*

attacked Kāhar Khān Afghān ...... and fell upon Bahādurpūr, one Kos and a half from Burhānpūr.

The year must be wrongly given. Shivājī died on 24th Rabī' II 1091 H. = 14th May 1680 A. D. (*M. 'Ā.* 194, *l.* 6). It is therefore impossible for Sambhājī to have raided Burhānpūr on the 15th February of that year. It is possible that the day of the month is correct, but the year must have been 1092 H. The Julian equivalent of 20th Muḥarram 1092 H. was 30th January 1681 A D. Sambhājī is stated to have been crowned on 10th of Māgh Shuddha 1602 *Shaka* or 18th January 1681 A. D. (Sardesai, I. Pt. iii. 20; Kincaid, II. 4). He may have undertaken the raid as soon as the festivities were over to signalise that event.

VII. 306, *l.* 13. *He [Sambhājī] made a forced march of three or four Kos, as was the practice in those days.*

از سي و پنج کروهی راه بطریق ایلغار که درآن ایام بهمین دستور تاخت می آوردند تاختہ

M. L. II. 272, *l.* 5. from foot.

"[After plundering in Berār], he traversed a distance of *thirty-five kos* by a forced march, as it was customary in those times to do so when suddenly raiding a country and made the attack". Sambhājī was somewhere in Berār, and Burhānpur on which he swooped down was about 35 *kos* from that place. A 'forced' march of only three or four *kos* would be a contradiction in terms. The Mahratta freebooters were famous "in those days" for such long marches and undertaking sudden raids of this hit-and-run type.

Dowson seems to have read or misread the words as سہ و پنج lit. '(between) three and five' and then paraphrased them as 'three or four'.

VII. 307, *l.* 17 from foot. *According to the current reports of some men who took a worldly view of things and had a bad opinion of Khān Jahān.*

بقول مشهور جمعی که سوی ظن درحق خان جهان بهادر موافق رویهٔ عالم داشتند

M. L. II. 274, *l.* 7 from foot.

"According to the widely-circulated reports of several persons who entertained a bad opinion of Khān Jahān Bahādur, just like the rest of the world".

They did not "take a worldly view of things", they thought, just as the majority of men and women of the time did. They agreed with their contemporaries in holding that Khān Jahān was unscrupulous and disloyal enough to do anything. The stories told in the M. U. and

elsewhere show that like most other foster brothers of the emperors he was a most insolent, arrogant and malapert upstart who was held in detestation by the classes as well as the masses.

VII. 308, *l.* 3 from foot. *Akbar proceeded by way of Lāhore and Multān and under the guidance of the zamīndārs, he then passed by difficult roads through the hills towards the Dakhin.*

It was just the other way. He gave the road by "way of Lāhore" as wide a berth as he could. Fugitives who have incurred the implacable hostility of a powerful despot and are relentlessly pursued by the united armies of a great empire do not travel along high roads.

محمد اکبر راه شارع لاهور و ملتان را گذاشتم برهنمائی زمینداران از راه دشوار گذار و جبال سمت دکن مرحلم پیما گردید
M. L. II. 276, *l.* 12.

Dowson seems to have wrongly read گذشتم 'passed, crossed', instead of گذاشتم 'left, abandoned'.

We now know from other sources that after one or two days, Akbar was taken under his protection by Durgādās, who led him by way of Sānchor in Mārwār to Mewār, Dungarpūr, Bānswāra and South Malwa to the Narmadā, which was crossed at Akbarpūr. Then he turned towards Burhānpūr and passing through Rājpīpla, Khāndesh and Bāglān, reached Rāigaḍh (Tod, A. A. R. Ed. Crooke, I. 451). Instead of "proceeding by way of Lāhore and Multān", *i.e.* northwards of Ajmer, he pursued his flight through the country lying to the south of it (*M.* '*Ā.* 204, 205, 206; Sarkar, H. A. III. 417-8).

VII. 311, *l.* 3. *He had settled the sum of one lac and 80000 rupees as the amount payable by half the towns connected with Burhānpūr.*

در مدت سه ماه از پورجات نصف بلده یک لک و هشت (هشتاد) هزار روپیه عائد سرکار سا ختم
M. L. II. 279, *l.* 7 from foot.

"He had, during the three months he had been in office, realised for the Government 180000 rupees from only half the (seventeen) *suburbs* of the town of Burhānpūr".

The word used is پورجات. The exaction appears to have been much more severe than Dowson's rendering makes it out. Khwāfī Khān states elsewhere that Burhānpūr had seventeen *porahs* and he gives the names of several. If he is right in stating, as he does elsewhere that the total amount yielded by the *jizya* of the whole empire

was only twenty-five lakhs, this man must have flayed and skinned the poor as well as the rich Hindus of Burhānpūr mercilessly.

VII. 312, *l.* 10. *When Prince Akbar went to Rāhirī ...... he was at first treated very kindly and respectfully and provision was made for the necessary expenses of his followers.*

But the B. I. text represents the matter just the other way round.

اولاً از آن مردود سلوک و مدارات موافق شان پادشاه زاده بظهور نمی آمد و
برای مردمی که همراه محمد اکبر بودند خرچ هم برفاه نمی رسید و تصدیع میکشیدند

M. L. II. 284, *l.* 3 from foot.

"At first, he did not receive from that reprobate the respectful behaviour and honorable entertainment becoming the dignity of an emperor's son. Nor was adequate provision made for the expenses of the people who accompanied him and they were in great straits and discomfort".

VII. 317, *l.* 3. *One of the enemy's chiefs pressed forward with a loud cry to the elephant of Khān Jahān ...... Khān Jahān encountered him, shouting out 'I am a nobleman'.*

This rendering is neither intelligent nor intelligible. What the Golkonda bravo did was to cry out loudly and ask

فیل سواری خاصهٔ سردار کدام است .... خان جهان بهادر بفریاد آمد
که خاصه منم

M. L. II. 2?7, *l*, 8 from foot.

'which is the *khāṣa* or special elephant reserved for the riding of the commander?' ...... Khān Jahān answered the cry and said "I am [here on] the *Khāṣa*".

This battle was fought, not in the 27th year, but in the 29th (1096-7 H. = 1685 A. D.) (H. A. IV. 343-4). The man who challenged the Mughal general was named Baḍe (not Bari) Khān and was known as 'Hāth pathar' as he was an unerring marksman with the sling, which he wielded with the deadly effect and precision of musketry.

VII. 319, *l.* 17. *The Prince sent a message to the enemy.*

It was not the prince [Muḥammad Mu'aẓẓam] who sent the message, but the Dakhnīs. It is clear from the B. I. text that the message or challenge was not sent *by* the Mughal prince but *to* him.

و دکنیها تا شام ثبات قدم ورزیده آخررو بفرار آوردند و بپادشاه زاده پیغام
نمودند که

M. L. II. 304, *l.* 3 from foot.

"And the Dakhnīs having fought bravely till the evening, at last turned their faces towards flight and sent *to* the prince a message to the effect that ......".

Dowson has overlooked the preposition prefixed to پادشاه زاده.

VII. 319, *l*. 10 from foot. *Mādanā Pant and his friends had raised suspicions in the mind of Abū-l-Hasan, that Muhammad Ibrāhīm had been the means of bringing the Prince thither.*[1]

مادنا و بعضی همدمان ...... محمد ابراهیم را نزد ابوالحسن متهم برجوع آوردن طرف پادشاهزاده ساختہ بدین مرتبہ دربارۂ او بدظن نموده بودند کہ در فکر دستگیر ساختن بلکہ بقتل رساندن اومیان هم قرار یافتہ بود

M. L. II. 305, *l*. 4 from foot.

"Mādaṇṇā and some of his adherents accused Muḥammad Ibrāhīm of taking the side of (or representing the interests of) the prince [*i.e.* of being a corrupt and secret partisan of the Mughals] and made him entertain such a bad opinion of him that it had been resolved to seize and even put him to death".

VII. 322, *l*. 13. *At the beginning of Sha'bān in the twenty-eighth year of the reign, he [Aurangzeb] set out from Sholāpūr.*

Correctly, the *twenty-ninth.* The exact date is given by the *M.* '*Ā.* as 2nd Sha'bān, 1097 H. (p. 276, *l*. 2 from foot). The thirtieth year of the reign began on 1st Ramaẓān of that year and Sha'bān 1097 H. was the last month of the twenty-ninth (*M.* '*Ā*. 276, *l*. 3 from foot).

The siege of Bījāpūr was commenced on the 2nd Jumāda I of the 29th year 1096 H. and the gates were opened on the 4th of Ẕī-l-qa'da 1097 H. in the 30th year, after an investment of 18 lunar months and two days (*Ibid*. 255, *l*. 2 from foot; 277, *l*. 9; 279, *ll*. 10 and 15). Aurangzeb marched in person to the town only because tbe operations had been conducted languidly and the siege had been unduly "protracted" by the usual strife and discension among the generals for about fifteen months.

VII. 327, *l*. 7. *So on the 18th Rabī'u-s-sānī, in the twenty-ninth year of reign [prince Mu'aẕẕam was arrested].*

Musta'id Khān puts it into the thirtieth *Julūs* or 1098 H. (*M.* '*Ā*. 294, *l*. 12 from foot). The exact date is given as 21st February 1687 A. D. (O. S.) (H. A. IV. 364) which corresponds to 18th Rabī' II. 1098 H.

VII. 329, *l*. 3. *In the middle of Rajab, when the siege [of Golkoṇḍa] had lasted three months.*

As Khwāfī Khān has just stated on *l*. 2 p. 326 that the siege began on the 24th of Rabī'u-l-awwal, it was nearer four than three months, in

the middle of Rajjab. On p. 331, *l.* 11 from foot, Dowson makes the author say that at the end of Sha'bān, the siege had lasted for (nearly) eight months. But the text has *Shawwāl* (II. 360, *l.* 8), and this is the right reading of the name of the month. The fort was ultimately taken on the 24th of Ẕī-l-qa'da 1098 H. (*M*, *'Ā*. 299, *l.* 7), exactly eight lunar months after "the royal army had taken up ground at gunshot distance" from the stronghold. The Julian equivalent was 21st September 1687 A. D. (O. S.)

VII. 333, last line. *Abū-l-Hasan ...... accompanied the Amīrs, carrying a great wealth of pearls upon his neck.*

با مالهاي مروارید که در گردن داشت باتفاق امرا سوار گردید

M. L. II. 365, *l.* 12.

"He was wearing several *mālās*, necklaces of pearls". ماله is the Persianised form of the Hindi *mālā* and مالهاي is the plural. Dowson has taken it to be the plural of the Persian مال. Elsewhere, Khwāfī Khān often uses the Hindustānī form ماله or مالا in this sense. مالهٔ مروارید occurs on M. L. II. 386, *l.* 6 from foot and 816, *l.* 6 from foot.

So Khwāfī Khān speaks of ناله torrent-bed [II. 485, *l.* 7 from foot and نالها (plural) at II. 98, *l.* 3, 503, *l.* 7 from foot, 746, *l.* 9 and 888, *l.* 2 from foot.]. ناله occurs in M. 'Ā. 133, *l.* 4 from foot also.

VII. 336, *l.* 2. *The property of Abū-l-Hasan ...... amounted to eight lacs and fifty-one thousand huns and two krors and fifty three thousand rupees, altogether six krors and eighty lacs and ten thousand rupees, besides jewels, inlaid articles and vessels made of gold and silver. The total in dams was one arb, fifteen krors, sixteen lacs and a fraction, which was the sum entered in the records.*

The figure for '*huns*' is wrongly given. It should be ***sixty-eight lakhs***, fifty-one thousand (II. 367, *l.* 5 from foot). If these *huns* are understood as 'Old' *huns* and valued at *seven* rupees each, the equation will work out quite right. (6,851,000 × 7 =) 47,957,000 rupees worth of *Huns* + *20,053000* silver rupees = 68,010000 rupees. For this value of 'Old' *Huns*, see Foster, English Factories, 1665–7, p. 327.

The real meaning of the second sentence is that the total revenue of the kingdom of Golkoṇḍa, was, in Mughal *dāms*, one *arb*, fifteen *krors*, thirteen *lakhs* and a little more or about 2,87,82,500 rupees.

جمع دامي يک ارب و پانزده کرور و سيزده لک و کسری دام در دفتر ثبت گرديد

M. L. II. 367 last line.

This is in fair accord with the figures given by Thomas from three *Dastūru-l-'Amals* of the reign of Aurangzeb. They are 109,28,65,000 *dāms*, 109,35,28,000 *dāms* and 100,28,35,000 *dāms*. According to still another return of about 1707 A. D. the total was 1,11,33,60,000 *dāms* or about 2,78,34,000 rupees (Revenue Resources of the Mughal Empire, pp. 42, 50).

VII. 337, *l.* 10 from foot. *Capture and execution of Sambhā (in the 34th year).*

Sambhājī or Shambhūjī was captured in the 32nd year and not the 34th, as Khwāfī Khān states. He was brought to Aurangzeb in his camp at Bahādurgaḍh on 5th Jumāda I, 1100 H. and executed on the 29th (11th March, 1689 A. D.) (*M. 'Ā.* 322, *l.* 10; 325, *l.* 5). Grant Duff, however, states on the authority of Mahratta Manuscripts, "that he was executed at Tuḷāpūr (on the Indrayāṇī river), about the beginning of August 1689 A. D. (H. M. reprint 1873, p. 160). Tuḷāpūr is another name of the village of Nāgargāon, sixteen miles north-north-east of Poona (*Ibid.* 159 and note). Aurangzeb himself was then encamped at Koregāon, twelve miles north-east of Poona. He is stated to have arrived there on the 21st of Jumāda I, 1100 H. (M. 'Ā. 325). The date given by Grant Duff is wrong. Sardesai *op. cit.* Pt. III. 99 and Kincaid and Parasnis (II. 57) agree in stating that he was executed at Tuḷāpūr on 11th March 1689 A. D.

VII. 342, *l.* 5 from foot. *About this time (thirty-fifth year, 1102 A. H.), it was reported that Rājgarh had been taken.*

This account is ambiguously worded and obscure. Rājgaḍh was one of the many forts taken by the Mughals in the 32nd year and Musta'id Khān registers the appointment of Abū-l-Khair Khān as its castellan in the 33rd year, 1100–1 H. (311, *l.* 6; 330, *l.* 7). It was *now reconquered* by the Mahrattas under Rāmchandra and Shankarājī in the 35th year 1102 H. (1690 A. D.) (H. A. V. 27 note).

Khwāfī Khān is in error also in stating that the Mahrattas invested the place "before the news of the capture of Sambhājī reached the neighbourhood". It was taken by the *Mughals* along with several other Mahratta forts, during the period of demoralisation which followed that *coup d 'etat*. See also Kincaid II. 80; Sardesai I. iv. 19. The precise date of its capture by the Mughals is given as 19th October 1689 A. D. (H. A. IV. 406) after an investment of about eleven months commencing December 1688 A. D.

VII. 343, *l.* 13. *It was now [35th year = 1102 H. 1661-2 A. C.] reported from Āgra, that when Āghar Khān came there, ... the Jāts attacked the caravan near Āgra. ...... Āghar Khān pursued them, ... but he was killed by a musket-ball.*

The year is given as 1097 H. = 1686 A. D. by Sarkar, H. A. V. 297-8. The *pālkī* order also was issued, according to the *M. 'Ā.* (370, *l.* 7) in the 39th year (1106 H.) and not the 35th as here stated.

VII. 348, *l.* 5 from foot. *The Prince [Kām Bakhsh] wished that the siege should be carried on in his name, but the generals acted on their own authority.*

پادشاهزاده در سعی آن بود که تسخیر قلعه بنام او بحضور نوشته شود و
سرداران صاحب اختیار طرف خود سعی داشتند

M. L. II. 419, *l.* 4 from foot.

The prince's object was that the glory (or *Kudos*) of the conquest of the fortress should be associated with his own name in the official despatch made to the imperial court, while the generals who were actually in command (*scil.* Asad Khān and Ẕū-l-fiqār) were "endeavouring to get the credit (or honour) given to themselves".

The credit of the conquest of Bījāpūr was given in the official reports to Ghāzīu-d-dīn Khān Bahādur Fīrūz Jang (Khwāfī Khān, II. 322, *l.* 14). Similarly, Akbar is said to have stated in the *farmāns* announcing the conquest of Asīrgaḍh that the credit for it was due to the exertions of Abū-l-Faẓl (Smith, Akbar, p. 299). The Ṭ. A. states that when Ḥājjī Khān and Shujā'at Khān jointly defeated Mallū Khān in Mālwā, the victory was announced 'in the name of Shujā'at Khān'. Ḥājjī Khān was recalled and the governorship of the province was vested solely in Shujā'at Khān.

چون فتح بنام شجاعت خان شد شیر خان حاجی خان راپیش خود طلبید و
حکومت مالوه بنام شجاعت مقرر کرد

Ṭ. A. Lith. 231, *l.* 8; B. I. text II. 103, *l.* 7.

VII. 349. *l.* 18. *Every one was to carry off what he could and the idea was that Santā would stop to plunder what was left, and not follow the retreating force.*

It was not only an 'idea' of the Mughal generals. They are said to have taken care to come to an understanding or arrangement to that effect, with the enemy.

و بقول مشهور نظر بر تقاضاي وقت باهم ساختم پيغام مصالحم بدين شرط
بميان آمد كم سنتا بتعاقب حال لشكر و سرداران كم هر آنچم دران اضطراب
با خود توانند برداشتن نم پرداختم بتاراج باقى بهير و اشياى كم دران بلكاه
يابد اكتفا نمايد

M. L. II. 420, *l.* 3 from foot.

"But there was a widely spread report that they, taking into serious consideration the exigencies of the time, negotiated a peace, the conditions of which were that Santā was not to pursue the commanders of the army, everyone of whom was to carry off what he was able to, in his perturbation, leaving the rest of the baggage and all other things in the camp to be pillaged, and that Santā was to rest content with what he found there (*i.e.* what was left behind, or remained of the heavy camp equipage). The 'common report' was not without foundation. "Asad Khān made secret overtures to Rājārām, offering a heavy bribe, if he was allowed to retreat to Wāndīwāsh unmolested" (Sarkar II. A. V. 90). The *M. 'Ā.* admits that Ẕū-l-fiqār had to retreat after making 'some sort of peace' (صلح گونہ text 359). See also Kincaid, II. 79.

VII. 351, *l.* 10. *The English were not at all alarmed at these threatenings.*

M. L. II. 423, *l.* 12. انگریز بدنامی این جرات اصلاً برخود نمیگرفت

"The English did not at all admit that they had been guilty of this act of boldness" [the piratical attack on and capture of the ship].

VII. 352, *l.* 21. *After that, I saw musketeers (bark-andāz), young men well dressed and arranged, drawn up in ranks.*

The words in the text are برق انداز مترش (M. L. II. 425, *l.* 6).

This مترش is the 'matross' of Hobson Jobson (p. 562), "an inferior class of soldiers in the artillery". It is the Germ. matross, Dutch Matrush, a sailor. It occurs frequently in old Anglo-Indian narratives of the 17th and 18th centuries. The 'matross' is defined in Smith's Universal Military Dictionary (1779) as "an apprentice to a gunner, a soldier in the royal regiment of artillery who assists in loading, firing and spunging the great guns" (*apud* Yule, *l. c.* 563).

VII. 352, *l.* 11 from foot. *Next, I saw some English children, handsome, and wearing pearls on the borders of their hats.*

بعد آن کلہ پوشان سال خورد مقطع کہ کنار کلاه آنها مروارید گرفتہ بودند

M. L. II. 425, *l.* 9.

"After them, hat-wearers *of mature age* and well dressed, whose hats had pearls on their borders".

سال خورد means 'old, aged'. زالي سال خورده is used for an old woman who had seen many years in the *Chachnāma*, text, 21, *l*. 7. پيران سال خورد occurs in Aḥmad Yādgār, text 51, *l*. 2. Khwāfī Khān uses درخت سال خوردهٔ کلان پيرسال خورد 479, *l*. 9. See also 643, *l*. 7 from foot, where Khwāfī Khān quotes the following couplet from an old poet thus: دهقان سال خورده چه خوش گفت باپسر

کہ اي نورچشم من بجز از کشتہ ندروي

Baranī speaks of چندين سران معمر سال خورده (T. F. 92, *l*. 5) and چند امراء پير سال خورده (*Ib*. 95, *l*. 3).

The word for 'young' is خورد سال or خرد سال *e.g.* زن وفرزندان خورد سال M. L. II. 453, *l*. 13; خواجہ سراى خوردسال *Ibid*. 323, *l*. 13. He speaks of Sambhājī as پسرخورد سال کہ نہ سال عمر داشت 'the nine years old young son' of Shivājī (*Ibid*. 190, *l*. 5). پسر خرد سال also occurs at Ibid 870, *l*. 10.

VII. 353, *l*. 14. *I heard from them that when the ship was plundered and they were taken prisoners, some men in the dress and with the looks of Englishmen ...... said in their own language, "We got these scars at the time of the siege of Sīdī Yākūt, but to-day the scars have been removed from our hearts".*

This is fully confirmed from the English records and the coincidence in phraseology proves the excellence of the author's sources of information. "All the passengers of the *Ganj-i-sawāi* agree in charging the English with the piracy and some of them say that at the time of the plunder, they recognised some Englishmen (previously known to them)". Surat Governor's Letter to Court, I. O. L. No. 26. See also Arnold Wright, Annesley of Surat, p. 167. "During the plundering, the pirates kept saying—'We are thus avenging on you the injury that Yakut and other imperialists had done to us at Bombay' and *they showed the wounds they had received at that time*" (*Ibid*. p. 19; Captain's Report quoted in Sarkar, H. A., V. 346-7 note). There is no doubt now that a number of Evory's men were Englishmen, who had been in the service of the East India Company. Most of them were "deserters who had thrown off their allegiance at the time of Keigwin's mutiny or subsequently in the disorders created by the Sidhi's invasion" (Wright, *loc. cit*. 169).

VII 353, *l.* 5 from foot. ***Your sovereign's officers do not understand how they are acting, but cast the blame upon me.***

M. L. II. 426, *l.* 4 from foot. ومردم پادشاه شما از عهده آنها برنمی آیند

"And the officers of your king are not able to acquit themselves satisfactorily in regard to them, (deal effectively with them, cope with them, repel their attacks).

VII. 354, *l.* 15. ***He showed himself throughout very thoughtful of 'Abdu-r-Razzāk Khān, and mindful of his obligation to protect him.***

اما نظر برپاس خاطر عبدالرزاق خان و عهد و قرار امان برخود هموار نموده
M. L. II. 427, *l.* 10.

"But out of regard for the feelings of 'Abdu-r-Razzāq Khān and the promises and the safe conduct he had given, he endured it all (bore it with equanimity, put up with it) patiently". Khwāfī Khān says that he was waiting for an escort sent by Yāqūt Khān and the English governor had, in pursuance of a request from 'Abdu-r-Razzāq, promised, "assistance to the convoy". Moreover, Khwāfī Khān had entered the English territory at the express invitation of their commander.

VII. 355, *l.* 13. ***Among the events of this year [the thirty-eighth 1105-6 A. H.], was the defeat of Kāsim Khān and [Himmat Khān by Santājī].***

Correctly, the thirty-*ninth*, 1107 H. (1695 A. D.) according to the *M. 'Ā.* 374-379; Sarkar, H. A., V. 112-122; Kincaid II. 86-7.

VII. 355 foot note, *l.* 3 from foot. ***According to the T. Chaghatāī, Himmat Khān was in a place called Biswāpatan, before he marched to his death.***

Dodairee is 25 miles north of Chitaldrug. Biswapattan is about 40 miles west of the same place. Lat. 14°-11′ N; Long. 75°-52′ E. (Thorton). It is now in Shimoga district, Mysore. It is shown as 'Basva Patna' in Constable, Pl. 34, Bb. Biswapattan is mentioned in the *M. 'Ā.* also as the place where Himmat Khān was encamped (379, *l.* 6).

VII. 359, *l.* 5 from foot. ***He [Santājī Ghorpaḍe] himself, being deprived of his power, fled to the hills and his own Māwals.***

The B. I. text reads the sentence differently.

M. L. II. 447, *l.* 5. وسنتا بی پرو بال گشتہ رو بجبال و ماوای خود گذاشت

"And Santā having been shorn entirely of his feathers, [utterly discomfited], turned his face towards the hills and his own place of residence" (ماوای).

'Māwal' is most probably wrong, as Santājī is said to have fled to and been trapped in the Mahādeva hills which are in North Sātāra district. Māval is the name of a belt of land about twenty miles broad to the east of the Ghāṭs in the western portion of the Poona district" (H. A. IV. 13, 23). Santājī appears to have fled after his defeat first to Masūr in North Sātāra and to have been killed while bathing in a pool in the Shambhū Mahādeva hills in the North Sātāra district.

VII. 360, *l.* 8 from foot. *['Abdu-r-Razzāq Lārī] was now (scil. in the 39th year) deprived of the faujdārī of Rāhirī and summoned to court.*

The year was the 41st according to the *M. 'Ā.*, which records the appointment of Ismā'īl Makhā as his successor [in the *Faujdārī* of Islāmgaḍh-Rāhirī (p. 387, *l.* 8 from foot)] in the chronicle of that year (1109 H.). 'Abdu-r-Razzāq's original appointment is entered in the annals of the 36th year 1103 H. (*Ibid.* 347, *l.* 10). See also the biographical notice in the M. U. II. 820, *l.* 12.

VII. 361, *l.* 3. *Rām Rājā ...... having left the fort of Jāt, in the district of Rājgarh, went to Jinjī and other strong places.*

This 'Jat' is another geographical phantasm like 'Nakhach nuhgirahi' and others.

رام راجا براد رسنبای جهنمی کہ از قلعہ جات ضلع راجگڈه بر آمده طرف چنچي و دیگر مکانهای قلب پناه برده

M. L. II. 449 last line.

"Rām Rājā, the brother of the hell-dog Sambā having come out of the forts of the district of Rājgaḍh, had taken refuge in Chanchī and other mountainous places".

قلعہ جات is used here, as in many other places, as the *plural* of قلعہ fort, and as one word, by Khwāfī Khān (text II. 181, *l.* 4; 183, *l.* 7; 184, *l.* 4; 228, *l.* 7). On p. 383, *l.* 13, he states that Fīrūz Jang was sent in 1101 H. by Aurangzeb (براي تسخير قلع جات سمت راجگڈه وغیره روانہ فرمودند). پورجات occurs on *Ibid.* II. 273, *l.* 3 from foot, صوبہ جات on 518, *l.* 5, قصبہ جات on 410, *l.* 15 and قصبجات on 461, *l.* 4. کارخانہ جات is used in *M. 'Ā.* 14, *l.* 2.

There is a small town called 'Jath' in the Dekkan but it is not near Rājgaḍh which lies about thirty miles south-west of Poona. Jath or

Juth, as Thornton calls it, is now in South Sātāra district about 136 miles south-east of Poona.

Rājārām was a prisoner in Raigaḍh when Sambhājī was captured and led off to his doom. Soon after his nomination as regent, he visited Pratāpgaḍh, Sātāra, Paraḷī and Rāṅgṇā. For a time, he took refuge in Panhāḷā and just before the capture of Sambhājī's family, he fled to Vishāḷgaḍh (Kheḷṇā), thence to Bednūr and finally to Jinjī (Grant Duff 162–3; Kincaid II. 69–74; Sarkar, H. A., IV. 404–5; V. 22 25).

VII. 361, *l.* 13 from foot. *In the month of Muharram of this year, [the fortieth], the river Bhīmrā rose to a great height and overflowed causing enormous destruction.*

The date was the 10th of Muharram of the following year, *i.e.* the 41st, according to the *M. 'Ā.* 387, *l.* 1 from foot. The Hijra year was 1109. The Julian correspondence would be 19th July 1697 A.D. (O.S.) (Sarkar, H. A., V. 130). Kincaid puts it wrongly into 1699 A. D. (II. 96).

The flood in the *nāla* (torrent-bed) near Khawāṣṣpūr occurred in the 44th year on 28th Rabī' II. 1112 H. and not in the 42nd, (*M. 'Ā.* 431, *l.* 2). Sarkar (H. A., V. 170–1) gives 1st October 1700 A. D. (O. S.).

Grant Duff places it "on the banks of the Māṇ river" (H. M. 175). Kincaid agrees and adds that it is in Sholāpūr district. Sarkar asserts that this is impossible, because it is 3 miles east of Bhūshaṇgaḍh, instead of being as the M. Ā. states it was, only one march from that fort. He locates it on the *Nāndaṇī* river a few miles *west* of Bhūshaṇgaḍh and not *east* of it (*loc. cit.* note). Mr. Sardesai, however, states that the Khawāṣṣpūr intended is that on the Māṇ river which is in the sub-division of Sāngole in the district of Sholāpūr (I. Pt. IV. 116, 110). Aurangzeb is said to have selected this spot because it was "well-supplied with grass and hay and fruit trees and water" (p. 369). Sāngole is said in the district gazetteer to have been known in those times as the Golden Sāngole (*Sonyāche Sangole*) on account of its extraordinary prosperity (Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. XX, Sholapur p. 485). Perhaps, Mr. Sardesai, Kincaid, Parasnis and Grant Duff who were all personally acquainted with the place and the district are right. The matter may be left there.

VII. 366, *l.* 12. *A great number of Hindu infantry soldiers had been killed all at once (in the explosion).*

M. L. II. 468, *l.* 8. چون بکسریم پیادهٔ هنود بسیار کشته گردیده بودند

"As a great number of *Baksariya* Hindu infantry had been killed". The use of the word 'Baksariya' here is worthy of note. See Yule, Hobson Jobson, Ed. 1903, p. 103 *s. v.* Buxerry and my note in S. I. M. H. Vol. I. 672 on E. D. VII. 452, *l.* 2 from foot.

VII. 367, *l.* 6 from foot. *He [Sobhān, the commandant of Sātāra]...... offered to capitulate on honourable terms, if the proposal of the commandant of Parlī were rejected.*

اگر امان جان و آبرو یابم و تقصیر قلعه‌دار پرلي معاف نشود

M. L. II. 470, *l.* 11.

"If he was given assurances of the safety of his own person (lit. life) and honour and the contumacy of the castellan of Paraḷī was not forgiven (or condoned)" *i.e.* if his enemy was not given any quarter and Paraḷī was taken, not by negotiation, but by force.

The real name of the castellan is given as Subhānjī Lāvghare by the Mahratta authorities (Sardesai, IV. 114).

VII. 370, *l.* 7 from foot. *The enemy abandoned the fort of Pārasgarh, Bahramand Khān was sent against the forts of Chandan-Mandan and by the middle of Jumāda -l-awwal, all the four forts were taken.*

Dowson notes that 'Pārasgaḍh' is, for some reason he cannot make out, spoken of as 'Sādiqgaḍh' in the index to the Bibl. Ind. text of Khwāfī Khān. The name 'Pārasgaḍh' does not occur anywhere in the *M. 'A.*, but it is stated there that Ṣādiqgaḍh was the new name given to Wardangaḍh (or Wardhangaḍh) as a compliment to Fatḥullāh Khān, whose name was Muḥammad Ṣādiq. Khwāfī Khān speaks of "all the *four* forts having been captured", but gives the names of only three. The fourth was 'Nāndagirī', renamed 'Nāmgīr' (*Ibid.* 443, *l.* 3 from foot), which lies about fourteen miles north-east of Sātāra. Wardhangaḍh is situated nineteen miles north-east, and Chandan-M(W)andan ten miles due east of Sātāra. (Satara Gazetteer, B. G. XIX, pp. 527, 602 and 458). The correct Marathi name of 'Nāndgīr' is 'Nāndagiri' (Kincaid I. 241).

VII. 371 last line. *So, after six months' siege on the 19th of Muharram 1113 (16th June 1701), [Khelṇā was surrendered to Aurangzeb].*

The Hijra year is wrongly given by Dowson. It should be 1114 (M. 'Ā. 457, *l.* 11). The exact date was 19th Muḥarram = 4th June 1702 A. D. (O. S.). See also Sarkar, H. A., V. 166. The date of the capture of

Rājgaḍh is also out by a year. It was not taken on the 28th of Shawwāl 1114 H., but about a year later on the 21st of Shawwāl 1115 H. = 16th February 1704 A. D. (O. S.) (*M. 'Ā.* 485, *l*, 4; Sarkar, H. A. V. 191; M. U. I. 608, *l.* 9).

VII. 372, *l.* 12. *The clemency ...... of the emperor was such that when several fortresses had been long and vigorously besieged by the forces appointed to the duty, he paid sums of money to the commandants and so got the forts into his possession.*

This is all wrong.

حلم و بردباری و خبرداری پادشاه بدین مرتبه بود که چون پادشاه عالمستان تحقیق میدانست که اکثر قلعجات امرای دوردست ...... آخر مبالغ بقلعدار داده کلید قلعه بدست می آوردند و هرکارها خبر آن به تعین مبلغ میرساندند

M. L. II. 502 last line.

"The mildness and self-control of the emperor were carried so far that though he knew for certain that the *amirs* who were besieging forts in remote provinces had obtained [the surrender of] the keys of the castles from their [Mahratta] commandants only after paying them large sums of money, and although the exact amounts paid by the *amirs* as bribes were reported to him by the spies, etc."

When Aurangzeb's generals failed to take the forts by force, they bought them with gold from the Mahratta castellans. When Aurangzeb came to know from his secret informers the sum of money which had changed hands in each case, he used to give the exact amount as *in'ām* to the Mughal *general* who had purchased the fort and given the bribe to the Mahratta officer.

VII. 375, *l.* 9 from foot. *Two or three well-mounted light horsemen appeared on one side, and the Ahmadābād army made ready to receive them.*

دوسه هزار 'two or three *thousand*', in M. L. II. 519, *l.* 4, which is undoubtedly correct.

VII. 382, *l.* 14 from foot. *The Imperial army then retired to pass the rainy season at Deogānw, three or four Kos from the Kistnā.*

The *M. 'Ā.* speaks of it as 'Devāpūr' (text 507, *l.* 13) and a village of that name still exists about eight miles south of Wākinkera (H. A., V, 244) or Wākinkheḍa as Sardesai (IV. 15, 111, 141) spells it. **Kincaid agrees with him (II. 113 note). But Sarkar calls it Wagingera (H. A., V. 221-34).**

VII. 384, *l.* 13. *But he had observed the altered temper of his father, whose feelings were not always in their natural state.*

نظر بر انحراف مزاج پدر بزرگوارکہ اکثر طبع بحال نبود اول بدین فکر افتاد

M. L. II. 546, *l.* 7.

"But in view of the change for the worse in his venerable father's health, which had, for the most part, been out of order (for some time), the thought occurred to him".

Khwāfī Khān says only a few lines lower down (II. 547, *l.* 6) باز مزاج پادشاه پاره بحال آمد and Dowson's rendering is 'the emperor slightly improved *in health*' (384, *l.* 2 from foot). مزاج does not here mean 'temper', but 'bodily constitution, general health, physical condition'.

Elsewhere, Khwāfī Khān writes:

از آنکہ پادشاه عاقبت بین مزاج خود را خالی از مادهٔ خلل نیافتند

M. L. II. 548, *l.* 12.

and Dowson translates it thus: "The foresight of the emperor told him that his *health* was failing" (E. D. VII. 385, *l.* 6 from foot). Aurangzeb's illness in the fifth year of his reign is also described as انحراف مزاج (II. 155, *l.* 3) and the phrase is again used for the attack of gout which he had in the 49th year (II. 539, *l.* 5, II. 541, *l.* 5). The identical locution is found in the *M.* '*Ā*. 508, *l.* 6 in connection with the same illness. The synonymous expression تبدیل مزاج is used for Bahādur Shāh's last illness (II. 683, *l.* 7 from foot). برهم خوردن طبع is used for the pretended illness and emesis of A'tamādu-d-daula by Khwāfī Khān (II. 903, *l.* 6 from foot = E. D. VII. 503).

VII. 385. *l.* 3. *Kām Bakhsh who was a poet and learned man.*

کام بخش کہ حافظ کلام الله و از علم عقلی و نقلی بهره تمام داشت

M. L. II. 547, *l.* 10.

"Kām Bakhsh who had learnt the whole of the Qurān (lit. the Word of God) by heart and possessed a thorough knowledge of the traditional and rational sciences".

Not only Kām Bakhsh, but his eldest brother, Muḥammad Sulṭān, his sisters, Zību-n-nisā and Badru-n-nisā and his father Aurangzeb had acquired the religious merit of repeating the Qurān by rote (*M.* '*Ā*. 534, *l.* 8, 538, *l.* 8, 539, *l.* 3 from foot). Musta'id Khān notes the fact that when Kām Bakhsh became a 'Ḥāfiẓ' بسعادت اتمام حفظ

کلام ملک علام فایض شدند in 1088 H., Aurangzeb was so pleased that he gave him several valuable presents. He was then only eleven years old (*M. 'Ā.* 159, *l.* 2). Farrukhsiyar also was a 'Ḥāfiẓ' (Irvine, L. M. I. 159). It may be as well to explain that theology, jurisprudence and *ḥadīṡ* (traditions) are the principal علوم نقلي and philosophy, logic, rhetoric, astronomy, geography and history are علوم عقلی.

VII. 385, *l.* 13 from foot. *The Emperor wrote a letter with his own hand, saying that he had heard of the suspicions and apprehensions shown by Hasan Khān.*

بدستخط خاص نوشتند که وجود حسن خان معلوم که ازطرف او این همه مغلوب وسواس و هراس گردد

M. L. II. 548, *l.* 7.

He wrote a letter with his own hand saying, "The (small or limited) extent of Ḥasan Khān's power is known (to us all). It is strange that you [a great prince] should be so over-powered by the dread and terror (of his name)". Khwāfī Khān states that the prince "winced under the censure implied in this letter".

از مضمون طعن آمیز جواب برخود پیچید

M. L. II. 548, *l.* 10.

But there is no trace of 'censure' or 'sarcasm' in Dowson's rendering of the reply. The real meaning is "What is a fellow like Ḥasan Khān after all? Why are you, a prince of the blood, so perturbed and agitated by any thing such as a whipper-snapper does". It was really a polite but stinging rebuke and when it is interpreted in this way, Khwāfī Khān's remark becomes easily intelligible. A'ẓam must have felt that he had only lowered himself in his stout hearted father's opinion by making such a fuss and getting so funky or panicky about trifles.

VII. 385 last line. *He [Aurangzeb] sent Kām Baksh with all the signs of royalty to Bījāpūr, and the drums of the royal naubatkhāna were ordered to play as he departed.*

و حکم نمودند که از حضور نوبت نواخته روانه شود

M. L. II. 548, *l.* 5 from foot.

"And His Majesty gave orders that he [Kām Bakhsh] was to march from the precincts of the imperial head-quarters, with his (own) kettle-drums beating".

No subject was allowed, unless specially permitted, to beat his drums within a certain distance (about 12 *Kos* or 24 miles) of the emperor's palace or camp. Khwāfī Khān states that Bahādur Shāh

gave such permission as a special favour to Asad Khān, Mun'im Khān and Ẕū-l-fīqār Khān (text II. 600, *l*. 4 from foot; 646, *l*. 6 from foot).

Khwāfī Khān also informs us that when Sayyid Ḥusain 'Alī Khān entered Dehlī on his return from the Dekkan, he "showed his rebellious designs by ordering his drums to be beaten loudly in defiance, for it is contrary to all rule for a subject's drums to be beaten near the residence of the emperor" (Ed. VII 474 = text II. 804, *l*. 6 from foot). When Dārā Shikoh advanced from Dehlī to encounter Aurangzeb and Murād Bakhsh, he is *said to have been permitted by* Shāh Jahān, "as a special favour, to mount his chariot, at the steps of the Dīwān-i-Khās, *to beat his drums* and march out in full regal pomp from that very spot" (H. A. II. 36). See also '*Amal-i-Ṣāliḥ* III. 289, *l*. 13.

VII. 386, *l*. 12 from foot. *He [Aurangzeb] was ninety years and some months old [at his death].*

He was ninety-one lunar years and thirteen days old at the time of his death, as the more exact chronicler Musta'id Khān declares (*M. Ā.* 523, *l*. 11). This mistake is the direct result or corollary of another erroneous supposition of Khwāfī Khān's—that Aurangzeb was born in 1028 H.—instead of 1027 H. See my note on E. D. VII. 213, *l*. 7 from foot in S. I. M. H. Vol. I. p. 712.

The Julian equivalent of the date of Aurangzeb's death is given by Dowson as 21st February 1707 A. D. (O. S.). If the week-day was, as every one [including Manucci (IV. 398)] says, a Friday the N. S. equivalent would be 4th March.

VII. 386, *l*. 8 from foot. *And some districts of Burhānpūr were assigned for the maintenance of his tomb.*

و چند دیہ سیر حاصل از پرگنات نواح خجستہ بنیاد .... جدا ساختہ
...... برای خرج مزار آن خلدآرامگاه مقرر گردانیدند

M. L. II. 549, *l*. 4 from foot.

'Khujista-bunyād' is the *alias* or honorific epithet of Aurangābād, not of Burhānpūr. The village is now known as Khuldābād and is about ten miles north-west of Aurangābād and four miles west of Daulatābād.

Bahādur Shāh, Shāh 'Ālam I is said to have made a *Waqf* or endowment of villages in the neighbourhood yielding 50000 rupees annually for the maintenance of his father's mausoleum (Khwāfī Khān, II. 649, *l*. 13; Irvine, Later Mughals, I. 7).

VII. 387, last line. *Prince Bedār Bakht, who had been left at Ahmadābād, in charge of the government, arrived. Ibrāhīm Khān also thought of coming, but an order was issued for his going to the frontier of Mālwā, there to await further orders.*

بشاهزاده بیدار بخت کہ در احمد آباد بہ نیابت خود گذاشتہ آمده بود و بعد رسیدن ابراهیم خان صوبہ دار در فکر بر آمدن بود حکم بدین مضمون صادر شد کہ بسرحد مالوا رسیده منتظر حکم دیگر باشد

M. L. II. 566, *l.* 3 from foot.

"He [A'ẓam Shāh] had come [to Aḥmadnagar] after leaving prince Bīdār Bakht as his own deputy in Aḥmadābād. *When* Ibrāhīm Khān (who had been appointed permanent) Ṣūbadār of the province arrived, the prince expressed his desire to come forth (march straight to Āgra), but he was directed to proceed to the frontier of Mālwā and there await further orders".

The whole passage has been misunderstood. Bīdār Bakht never "arrived" at Aḥmadnagar or anywhere near it. The subject of آمده بود is his father, A'ẓam Shāh. Ibrāhīm Khān was transferred from Kashmīr to Aḥmadābād in 1116 H. (*M. 'Ā.* 496 last line), but as he was not able to take over the government for many months after the date of appointment, Bīdār Bakht held *interim* charge of the province. What Khwāfī Khān means is that if Bīdār Bakht had been allowed, by A'ẓam, *to join his forces with those of Ibrāhīm Khān and march at once along* with him upon Āgra, they would have been able to anticipate Bahādur Shāh and take possession of that city and the treasure in its castle. This was the "plan of Ibrāhīm Khān", but this "right and advisable course" was knocked on the head by the unnatural and cantankerous jealousy of A'ẓam who ordered his son (not Ibrāhīm Khān) to await his own arrival in Mālwā. But if Irādat Khān's statements are to be believed, this 'jealousy' was perfectly justifiable, as Bīdār Bakht had been all along entertaining designs of ousting his father and of even getting rid of him by assassination (E. D. VII. 540).

VII. 388, *l.* 17. *Ibrāhīm Khān then placed in the hands of Murād Khān a letter which he had received at Ahmadābād on the 10th from his Vakīl at Ahmadnagar, informing him of the sad event which had occurred (scil. the death of Aurangzeb).*

ابراهیم خان خط وکیل را کہ روز دهم از احمدنگر باحمد آباد مشتمل بر خبر واقعۂ ناگزیر حضرت خلد مکان رسیده بود

M. L. II. 567, *l.* 11.

The letter had not reached Aḥmadābād on the 10th day of the following month (Ẓī-l-ḥijja), but on the 10th day after the day on which it had been despatched, *i.e.* 28th Ẓī-l-qa'da, the date of Aurangzeb's decease. It is stated to have reached Ibrāhīm Khān *before* the 9th of Ẓī-l-ḥijja, the day on which Muḥammad Murād Khān received the *Khil'at* (*l.* 8).

VII. 389, *l.* 13. ***In fact, if Muhammad 'Azam Shāh had not been mistrustful and forbidden it, he [Ibrāhīm Khān] would have helped Prince Bedār Bakht on his way.***

M. L. II. 568, *l.* 6 from foot. بیدار بخت را ماذون می ساخت and *permitted* Bīdār Bakht (to march straight upon Āgra). The meaning is that as Āgra was less distant from Aḥmadābād than Kābul, Bīdār Bakht would have arrived there before Bahādur Shāh and would have been able to secure the treasure and the fortress, as Bāqī Khān, the castellan, had declared his readiness to deliver the citadel to "whichever of the heirs who should present himself first", and Mukhtār Khān, the Ṣūbadār of the province, was Bīdār Bakht's father-in-law. ماذون means 'permitted, allowed, invited', not 'forbidden'. The triliteral root اذن means 'leave, permission' (Richardson).

VII. 392, *l.* 12. *On the 7th of Zī-l-hijja, the news of Aurangzeb's death reached Peshāwar.*

It is *27th* in the text II. 573, *l.* 8 from foot. Aurangzeb died at Aḥmadnagar on the 28th of Ẓī-l-qa'da and the distance between the two places, about 1400 miles, is too great to have been covered in only ten days. Banārasī, the swiftest foot-courier in India, was able to announce the news of Jahāngīr's death in Kashmīr to Shāh Jahān in Juner only after twenty-two days. (*Iqbālnāma* 298, *l.* 3; Muḥammad Hādī, Continuation of the T. J. 423, *l.* 16).

Mr. Irvine (L. M. I. 19) says that Mu'aẓẓam heard the news at Jamrūd, twelve miles west of Peshāwar *twenty days* after the event on the 22nd of March 1707 A. D. (N. S.), which would correspond to 17th Ẓī-l-ḥijja, which is the date given in the *Tārīkh-i-Muẓaffarī* (MS in my possession).

The news is said to have reached Aḥmadābād, according to Dowson's translation (p. 388) on the 9th of Ẓī-l-ḥijja. It is consequently impossible for it to have arrived at Peshāwar two days earlier. As Khwāfī Khān himself repeatedly states that the anniversary of Bahādur Shāh's coronation was celebrated, in subsequent years, on the

18th of Ẕī-l-ḥijja, the 17th of that month must have been the day on which the news reached him (text II. 607, *l.* 9, 646, *l.* 8; 662, *l.* 2 from foot; 683, *l.* 8). Vide also my H. S. M. N. 278–9.

VII. 392, *l.* 4 from foot. *At the end of Muharram 1119 (April 1707), the prince encamped at Lāhore. There he remained over the new moon of Safar and gave orders for the coining of money and reading the Khutba in his name.*

اواخر محرم الحرام سنه [۱۱۱۹] مذکور نواح دار السلطنت لاهور شرف نزول فرمودند در آن منزل مبارک که در سلخ محرم و غره سفر المظفر از عدم رویت اختلاف بود مقام نموده بزدن سکه و خواندن خطبه بنام نامی خود حکم فرمودند

M. L. II. 574, *l.* 12.

"Towards the end of Muḥarram of the said year (1119 H.), he arrived in the environs of Lāhore. There, *i.e.* in Lāhore, he ordered coins to be struck and the *Khuṭba* to be read in his glorious name, either on the last day of Muḥarram or the 1st day of Ṣafar, as there was a difference of opinion in regard to the exact date on account of the *new moon* having not been clearly seen".

The meaning is that some people reckoned it as the last day of Muḥarram, while others who asserted that the *new moon* had been seen, took it as the 1st day of Ṣafar. See also my H. S. M. N. 278.

VII. 393, *l.* 14. *Spies and news-writers reported that Bākī Khān had written with great humility to Prince Muhammad ʻAzam.*

گویند باقی خان در سپردن کلید قلعه و خزانه از روی عجز و نیاز بخدمت پادشاه زاده محمد عظیم التماس نموده که

M. L. II. 577, *l.* 5.

"*The common report is* (lit. people say) that Bāqī Khān had, in connection with the surrender of the fort and the treasure, written humbly and submissively to prince *Muḥammad ʻAẓīm*". The name of the prince to whom the letter was addressed is wrongly given in Dowson's version and the uncle has been confounded with the nephew.

VII. 393, *l.* 18. *There was not a single person who, doubted that comparing the distance of Peshāwar with the difficulties in the way of ʻAzam Shāh, Ṣhāh ʻĀlam would arrive before him.*

و هیچ احدی را گمان نبود که با وجود آن همه بعد مسافت پشاور نظر بر ترددد محمد اعظم شاه شاه عالم قبل از محمد اعظم شاه خواهد رسید.

M. L. II. 577, *l.* 9.

But *perhaps* the meaning is very different. "No one *imagined* that in view of the great distance of Peshāwar and the rapid march of A'ẓam Shāh, Shāh 'Ālam would arrive at Āgra before the latter".

Khwāfī Khān perhaps means that the unexpected had happened. The odds were all against Shāh 'Ālam, but he won contrary to all conjectures, or intelligent anticipations. The 'favourite' had lost and the prophets were confounded. گمان signifies 'opinion', as well as 'doubt' or 'suspicion'. Richardson says that در گمان بودن or گمان داشتن or گمان کردن means "to think, imagine, suppose, believe, conjecture, fancy, doubt, suspect". The sentence is undoubtedly susceptible of a double meaning.

VII. 398, *l.* 12 from foot. *On the 18th Rabī'u-l-awwal, 1119 A. H. (10th June 1707 A. D.), the two armies joined battle at Jājū.*

The text gives also the corresponding Ilāhī date as 29th Khurdād (II. 590, *l.* 9). This is the 91st day of the Ilāhī year and the 160th of the Julian (91 + 69) or 10th June (O. S.). Similar correspondences are given of several other important events in the latter part of Khwāfī Khān's work. He must have obtained them from the Wāqa' and other official documents and this shows that the Ilāhī or solar reckoning continued to be employed and the solar dates were registered in the records of the revenue and other departments. The common notion that Aurangzeb forbade or abolished the registration of Ilāhī dates and banished it for ever from the secretariate appears to be founded on an erroneous interpretation of the statements of the chroniclers. I have discussed the matter more fully in my 'Historical Studies in Mughal Numismatics', pp. 29–35.

Manucci avers that the battle lasted for three days, and A'ẓam Shāh was killed on the third and last, *i.e.* the 21st of June 1707 A. D. (N. S.) (Storia, IV. 402–3). See also my H. S. M. N. 277.

VII. 399, *l.* 20. *'Azam Shāh flew into a rage, and said, 'go with your bravery and save your life wherever you can'.*

بهادرجی شما جان خود را درهرجا کہ خواهید سلامت ببرید حرکت ما ازین
مکان زمین متعذر است

M. L. II. 596, *l.* 12.

"Well, Mr. Bahādur ('My Brave Fellow') you may take your person safely to any place you please. My budging from this spot is impossible".

'Bahādurjī' is an ironical form of address expressing contempt for the person who counselled the flight from the battle-field.

VII. 401, *l.* 3. *Na'īm Khān, his eldest son, received the title of Khān Zamān Bahādur ...... and a robe of the third rank.*

M. L. II. 599, *l.* 2. خلعت بخشی سیوم مرحمت نمودند

The emperor bestowed upon him the dress of honour (of the post) of third *Bakhshī*. There were four *Bakhshīs* in all. Khwāfī Khān himself records the appointment of four *Bakhshīs* by the puppet Muḥammad Ibrāhīm soon after his accession (text II. 914, *l.* 6 from foot; E. D. VII. 509).

VII. 402, *l.* 2. *He [Asad Khān] was also presented with four stallions, five horses with accoutrements, etc. etc.*

بعطای چهارقب و پنج اسپ با ساز طلا و یراق نقره و سرپیچ مرصع سرافرازی بخشیده

M. L. II. 600, *l.* 6 from foot.

He exalted him [Asad Khān] by the gift of a *Chihārqab* and five horses with gold trappings and silver housings.

The *Chihārqab* or *Chārqab* was, according to Richardson, "a vest without sleeves, peculiar to a *vazīr*". See the note on E. D. V. 339, *l.* 10 from foot in this volume (p. 237).

VII. 402, *l.* 21. *On the day that Āsafu-d-daula acted as dīwān, it became incumbent upon Khān Khānān to wait upon him as other ministers did.*

روزی کہ آصف الدولہ دیوان نمود خان خانان را لازم گردید کہ بدستور دیگر امرا آمده مجرا نماید و ایستاده کاغذ بدستخط رساند

M. L. II. 601, *l.* 3 from foot.

"On the day on which Asad Khān *presided in the Dīwān,* the Khān-i-Khānān was, according to the canons of official etiquette, bound to make obeisance to him and keep standing while submitting papers for his signature, like all other Amīrs".

This was because the *Wakīl-i-Muṭlaq* was higher in rank than the وزیر or prime minister. But the Khān Khānān who was now the real power behind the throne disliked and detested to pay unwilling court to and humiliate himself publicly before the old Asad Khān who was only a figure head.

VII. 407, *l.* 9. *He [Kām Bakhsh] used this blow so well in the face of three thousand foes.*

The B. I. text raises the number to 'twenty or thirty thousand'.

M. L. II. 623, *l.* 5. مقابل بیست وسی هزار سوار حمام آور گردید

Dowson may have thought it necessary, in the interest of historical truth, to 'draw it mild', but a translator is not justified in taking such a liberty with his author's words in this fashion.

VII. 410, *l.* 7 from foot. *The Kāzī of Warangal and many chief men of that country came to court with grievous complaints of a man named Pāp Rāi.*

M. L. II. 630, *l.* 3 from foot. روزانہ مشعلہا روشن کردہ مستغیث شدند

"They lighted torches during the day-time and came to court, begging for the redress of their grievances".

This was a time-honoured mode of compelling the attention of those in power to the complaint of a person who had failed to obtain justice by the usual methods in the courts of justice.

Khwāfī Khān again declares that the Qāẓī and other residents went to complain to the emperor himself, روزانہ مشعلہا روشن کردہ 'after lighting torches in the day' (II. 638, *l.* 7).

When a merchant wished to inform his creditors of his utter inability to discharge his liabilities, he used to have recourse to the same method of drawing public attention to his distressful condition.

Manucci tells a long story of an Armenian acquaintance of his own, who made a fraudulent declaration of bankruptcy in Patna. He states that "when the time came for paying the merchants, ***he in pursuance of the custom of the country***, lighted two candles in the morning, as a sign that he had become bankrupt; he sat at his house, with no turban on his head. ...... The merchants thronged to his house, to learn tbe cause ...... To all he replied with a sad countenance ...... by the word 'Divālīa', which means bankrupt" (Storia do Mogor, tr. Irvine, II. 84). Another old writer also tells us that "it is the custom for a merchant who finds himself failing or failed to set up a blazing lamp in his house, or shop, or his office and abscond therefrom for some time" (Drummond, Illustrations of the Grammatical Parts of the Guzarattee, Mahrattee and English Languages, Bombay, 1808, *S. V.* Dewaleea).

VII. 416, *l.* 3 from foot. *Hizbar Khān.*

Read 'Hizabr Khān' or 'Huzabr Khān' here, as well as on *l.* 10 from foot of p. 525. The word signifies 'lion'.

VII. 418, *l.* 10 from foot. *He went steadily forward, and after a volley or two from the infidels, he sent forward an elephant supported by forty or fifty thousand Musalmāns.*

بعد اتمام شلک اول و دو ویم کفار بدفرجام فوج اسلام فیل جرات پیش رانده بهمقدمی و رفاقت چهل و پنجاه هزار مسلمان .... صدای تکبیر همت افزا بلند نموده

M. L. II. 659, *l.* 5.

"After one or two volleys from the wicked infidels, the Muslim army moved forward the elephant of boldness and in close union with forty or fifty thousand other Musalmāns raised on high the heartening warcry of *Allāhu Akbar* etc.".

The language is figurative and the 'elephant' is purely metaphorical and not a creature of flesh and blood. The simile is borrowed from the game of chess in which the bishop is called فیل and فیل بند is a move in the game which is described in most dictionaries. Neither party is stated to have been in possession of any pachyderms in the original account.

VII. 422, *l.* 14. *Mīr Ahmad, in his contempt for a female warrior, having got together a force of eight or nine thousand horse ...... marched out.*

The text has هشتصد نه صد سوار eight or nine *hundred* horse (II. 666, *l.* 7 from foot) and the context indicates that the correct reading must be هشت صد نه صد سوار eight or nine hundred troopers. This raid on Rānwer is mentioned also in the *Burhān-ul-Futūḥ* (E. D. VIII. 30–1); but the name of the woman who led it is given as Tārābāī. The M. U. however says it was Tulsībāī (III. 663, *l.* 18) and that Mīr Aḥmad was so foolish as to go out to battle with only 700 horsemen (III. 664, *l.* 16).

VII. 423, *l.* 10. *Shāhābād, Mustafā-ābād, Shāhdhurā and other old seats of population.*

This Muṣṭafā-ābād must be the place of that name about twenty-five miles south-east of Ambālā. It is now a station on the Northern Railway. Shāhābād is about thirteen miles south, and Sādhaura about twenty-six miles east, of Ambālā.

VII. 425, *l.* 12. *Some men of name and position committed suicide to save the honour of their beards.*

The author is guiltless of uttering any such nonsense

و بعضی ریشداران صاحب اسم و رسم بدین سبب ریش اعتباری که داشتند بباد فنا دادند

M. L. II. 674, *l.* 12.

"And for this reason, several men of name and good position gave the beards which were the badges of respectability to the winds of destruction". Mr. Irvine descants thus on the incident.

"As the Sikhs had many well-wishers among the Khatrī clerks, *these men were thus forced to choose between losing their appointments* or committing an act that excluded them from the favour of the Sikh sect. The order was carried out, it seems, in a very harsh manner. Petty officers perambulated the streets followed by barbers bearing dirty water in a scavenger's vessel. Whenever a Hindu was seen wearing a beard, he was seized and his beard shaved off. The clerks in the imperial offices hid in their quarters, and did not appear again in public, until they had been shaved" (L. M. I. 106). What Khwāfī Khān means is that these men merely sacrificed, from prudent considerations, their beards. No one was fool enough to commit suicide.

VII 427, *l.* 5 from foot. *The Hājī said: 'I hope for four things from my bounteous Creator: 1. Acquisition of knowledge. 2. Preservation of the word of God. 3. The Pilgrimage. 4. Martyrdom'.*

حفظ کلام الله (II. 682, *l.* 8) really means 'learning by heart and retaining in the memory, the entire contents of the Qurān'. The Ḥājjī thanks God that he already enjoyed the first three blessings. He was (1) a person of some learning and, (2) a *Ḥāfiẓ* or person who had the whole of the Qurān at the tip of his tongue and, (3) he had also visited the holy places. Martyrdom only remained and he was glad to find that he was fairly on the way to attaining it. The name of the Ḥājjī's associate should be read as Muḥammad Murād (on *l.* 16). He was not a Khān (text II. 681, *l.* 4 from foot).

VII. 428, *l.* 15. *About the 20th Muharram 1123 (18th Feb. 1711 A.D.) ......there was a great change perceptible in him.*

اواخر عشر ثانی محرم الحرام (text II. 683, *l.* 8 from foot) would be more correctly rendered 'towards the end of the second decade of the month of Muḥarram'. On p. 430, *l.* 16, Dowson again speaks of "about the 20th of Safar", though the text has اواخر عشر ثاني صفر المظفر (II. 686, *l.* 14). Bahādur Shāh was taken seriously ill on the 18th of Muḥarram 1124 H. = 25th February 1712 A. D. (N. S.) and died on the 20th of Muḥarram = *night* of 27th February, 1712 A. D. (N. S.) (Irvine, L. M. I. 133-5). Others give 19th or 21st Muḥarram as the date of his death (H. S. M. N. 279).

He would appear to have had a stroke or to have been suffering from senility for he was troubled by delusions and gave orders to kill every dog in the camp and the city [of Lāhore] (Irvine, L. M. I. 133).

VII. 429, *l.* 5 from foot. ***Mirzā Sadru-d-dīn Muhammad Safawī, Bakhshi, deserted prince Azīmu-sh-Shān, and joined the party of prince Jahān Shāh; but the men of this prince held the Mirzā in such suspicion and distrust that by constant opposition they got him removed before the war began.***

میرزا صدرالدین محمدخان صفوی بخشی کہ از خانۂ عظیم الشان برگشتہ از
پیش فوج جہان شاہ می گذشت مردم لشکر جہان شاہ بگمان وظن غلط برسر
میرزا...... غافل ریختہ انقدر حربہای پیاپی بررساندند کہ قبل از آنکہ کار
بجنگ افتد فارغ ساختند

M. L. II. 685, *l.* 2 from foot.

"When Mirzā Ṣadru-d-dīn Ṣafavī Bakhshī was returning from the house of 'Aẓīmu-sh-Shān and passing before the camp of Jahān Shāh, the men of the latter's army, urged by unjust suspicions, fell upon him by surprise and struck him with so many spears one after the other, that they dispatched *i.e.* killed him before matters arrived at an appeal to arms".

The M. U. gives two conflicting accounts. One is that two or *three days before the battle,* he was returning برگشت from the camp of 'Aẓīmu-sh-Shān and passing by the encampment of Jahāndār when some men under an erroneous impression (بغلط) sprang upon him suddenly and cut him to pieces. The other is that *on the day of the battle,* when the cause of 'Aẓīm, appeared quite lost, he (Ṣadru-d-dīn) desired to join the camp of Jahāndār, but in the confusion and turmoil of the hour, some followers, suspecting his intentions, (بگمان) rained arrows upon him, and though he cried out aloud that he had no intention to fight, no one heard him and he was done to death with spears (III. 694, *l.* 8).

VII. 432, *l.* 6. *[Jahāndār] ordered Rustam Dil Khān and Allāh Wardī Khān who had been guilty of open and secret actions against him ...... to be ...... imprisoned.*

حکم فرمود کہ رستم دل خان و الہ وردی خان را کہ از تعدی ظاہری و افعال
دیگر باطنی او جہانی در فریاد بود ...... بانواع سیاست کشتہ بند بند
آنہا جدا نمایند

M. L. II. 688, *l.* 10.

"He gave orders that Rustam Dil Khan and Allāh Wirdī Khān, of whose public tyranny and other unknown (lit. secret) crimes, all the world was complaining ...... should be put to death after all sorts of torture and the severance of every joint of their limbs".

They were punished not because Farrukh-siyar had any personal grievance against them, but because they were universally execrated for their flagitious crimes and misdeeds of all sorts.

VII. 433, *l. 5.* *Jahāndār Shāh smiled and asked what bribe he wanted from Lāl Kunwar, and he [Ẓū-l-fiqār Khān] said, 'a thousand guitar-players and drawing-masters' (ustād-i-nakkāshi).*

The real point of this humorous dig at the emperor's expense has been missed in the translation. The meaning of the repartee is so grievously misconceived that it is made incomprehensible, if not absurd. How could Ẓū-l-fiqār have demanded and the brother of Lāl Kunwar have given to the minister a gift of a thousand *musicians* and *artists*, unless they had been the donor's purchased slaves, chattels chaffered for in the slave-market and liable to be handed over to and transferred from one master to another like Uncle Tom?

What Ẓū-l-fiqār said he wanted was 'a thousand guitars made by the best masters of the art', not so many 'players' on the instrument and "drawing masters". In view of this blundered paraphrase, it may be permissible to relate the anecdote as it is told by three other authors, *viz.* Wārid, Khush-ḥāl Chand and the Dutchman Valentyn. They say that a *Kalāwant* named Ni'mat Khān had been appointed Ṣūbadār of Multān. As there was unaccountable delay in the issue of the usual patent, the nominee made inquires of Ẓū-l-fiqār himself and was told that no patent was issued without a fee in cash, but as he wished to be obliging, he would not ask for ready money, but "take instead one thousand guitars". The stupid fellow, not seeing the ironical nature of this reply, worked his hardest, and in a week sent as many as two hundred guitars ...... The Wazīr insisted upon the delivery of the full number. Ni'mat Khān then complained to His Majesty, who, when he next saw the Wazīr, asked him the reason of collecting so many guitars. The answer was that when musicians were sent to govern provinces, *amīrs* must discard their weapons and learn to play on the guitar" (Irvine, L. M. I. 193). Khwāfī Khān's own words are:

M. L. II. 689 last line. هزار طنبوره کار استاد نقاشي مى خواهيم

The dissolute drunkard who had, by the freak of fortune, been able to sieze the throne, had the sense to see that "the joke was on himself" and the absurd appointment was sent to Limbo.

VII. 434, *l.* 12. *But Miyān Kokaltāsh Khān, father of Khwāja Hasan.*

The word used to express their relationship is نبیرہ grandson (text II. 697, *l.* 13). But Mr. Irvine says that Khwāja Ḥasan had married the sister of Kokaltāsh Khān's wife (L. M. I. 186, 197) and this is correct.

نبیرہ must be a copyist's error for بزنہ brother-in-law. Khwāfī Khān himself states elsewhere that Khwāja Aḥsan Khān was the بزنہ brother-in-law of Kokaltāsh (text II. 715, *l.* 4 from foot).

VII. 436, *l.* 9. *Farrukh-siyar's army did not number more than one-third of Jahāndār Shāh, which was advancing with difficulty.*

The relative is so wrongly placed as to invert the real meaning. The army "which was advancing with difficulty was not Jahāndār Shāh's, but that of his rival, Farrukhsiyar. Dowson himself speaks on p. 440 of Farrukhsiyar's lack of the sinews of war and of his being "in difficulty as to money". ... کمال عسرت خرج از پتنہ بر آمدہ (II. 715, *l.* 6). Khwāfī Khān's words are :

و از مقابل [فوج] فرخ سیر کہ سوم حصہ لشکر جہاندار شاہ فوج نداشت و بعسرت تمام طی مسافت می نمود

M. L. II. 700, *l.* 12.

and again

روزي کہ محمد فرخ سیر بکمال عسرت خرج و بی سرانجامی خود و سپاہ کہ ھمہ بحال تباہ ...... آن روی آب مقابل اکبرآباد رسیدہ بود

M. L. II. 719, *l.* 5 from foot.

The M. U. also clearly states that "most of the men of Farrukhsiyar had, on acconnt of his narrow and inadequate resources began to scatter (or desert) and a few only were able to keep company with him" (III. 133 last line).

VII. 437, *l.* 10. *On the 16th Zī-l-hijja, the armies confronted each other.*

Recte, 13th سیزدهم as in the text II. 701, *l.* 7 from foot. Irādat Khān also gives the 13th (E. D. VII. 561). سیزدهم and شنزدهم are very frequently confounded in Persian manuscripts. Here, as in some other places, Khwāfī Khān gives the corresponding Ilāhī day and month as 19th Dai (II. 701, *l.* 7 from foot). 13th Ẓī-l-ḥijja 1124 H. corresponded with 31st December, 1712 A. D. (O. S.). Now, 19th Dai is the 295th day of the Ilāhī year and the 366th (295 + 71) of the Julian. 13th Ẓī-l-ḥijja or 31st December is thus proved by calculation also to be the correct date. The *S. M.* gives the date of the battle as 14th Ẓī-l-iḥjja 1124 H. and adds that "Farrukhsiyar resolved to assume the crown instantly and ascended the throne at day break on Thursday, the 15th" (Tr. Briggs, 70, 77).

VII. 438, *l.* 2 from foot. *To his [Farrukhsiyar's] coming to court was disagreeable to his father.*

M. L. II. 708, *l.* 2. رفتن حضور بروشاق می نمود

It was 'disagreeable' to Farrukhsiyar himself. The excuses he is said to have brought forward for his malingering at Patna (want of money and approach of the rainy season) show that he was unwilling to obey the summons. "He was", writes Mr. Irvine, "no favourite with his father or grand-father, and had been without authority or wealth during their life time. It was only with reluctance that he had decided to obey his father's order to come to court" (L. M. I. 199).

VII. 439, *l.* 20. *Thereupon, Farrukhsiyar, in the beginning of Rabī'u-l awwal 1123 A. H. struck coins and had the Khutba read in his name.*

The Ilāhī date is given in the B. I. text (II. 711, *l.* 12) as the عشرثاني 'the second decade' of Farwardīn. 1st Rabī'u-l-awwal 1123 H. was 8th April 1711 A. D. 1st Rabī'u-l-awwal 1124 H. was 28th March 1712 A. D. (O. S.). The 'second decade' of Farwardīn *i.e.* 11th to 20th Farwardīn would correspond to the 21st to 30th March. The exact Hijra date is given by the contemporary chronicler, Ījād, as 29th Ṣafar 1124 H. = 27th March 1712 A. D. (O. S.) (Irvine, L. M. I. 199). The correct Hijra year was 1124 and not 1123 as Khwāfī Khān avers. See also my H. S. M. N. 280-1.

VII. 442, *l.* 2. *As variations appear in the most trustworthy histories, he begs that his stories may be excused.*

از آنکه در کتب معتبره سیر هم تفاوت روایت می باشد مسود
حکایات را معذور داشتم مطعون هدف تیر ملامت نسازند

M. L. II. 727, *l.* 11.

"As there are variations in the accounts of even standard historical works, the *author* [مسود] *of these narratives* trusts that he will be absolved of blame and not made a target for the arrows of censure". It is the 'author' for whom he pleads and whom he wants to be 'excused', not his 'stories'.

VII. 444, *l.* 11. *Mīr Jumla having brought ...... Zū-l-fiqār Khān, fastened his hands to his turban and thus presented him [to Farrukh-siyar].*

دستهای ذوالفقار خان را ببالا بند بستم ملازمت فرمود

M. L. II. 733, *l.* 10 from foot.

'Zū-l-fiqār Khān's hands were tied *with* his turban (not *to* his turban)'. He was neither manacled, nor were his wrists bound with

cords. They were fastened, only with his own turban or the *dopaṭṭā* which is worn over the waistbelt (*Kamarband*). Khwāfī Khān states that on one occasion, the prince Kām Bakhsh

بالا بند کمر خودرا وانموده دست خود و او را باهم بستہ استاد

M. L. II. 437, *l.* 2.

The Mahārājās Ajitsiṁha and Jaisiṁha are also said to have tied their hands with handkerchiefs when they submitted to Bahādur Shāh and paid homage to him. دست خود ها را بروماال بستہ (Khwāfī Khān, II. 662, *l.* 9. from foot, E. D. VII. 420).

So also, when Sayyid 'Abdullāh Khān was taken prisoner after the battle of Ḥasanpūr, and ushered into the presence of the emperor Muḥammad Shāh, "his hands were bound together *with* Ḥaidar Qulī Khān's shawl" (L. M. II. 92).

VII. 445, *l.* 4 from foot. *Hakīm Salīm had been one of the personal attendants upon 'Azīmu-sh-Shān, and it was said that the prince was killed at his suggestion. Mīr Jumla invited the Hakīm to his house [and had him strangled in the morning].*

The whole passage has been fearfully mangled and misunderstood.

و غریب تر آنکہ شاہ قدرت اللہ نام درویش کہ از تعلقۂ منصب و خدمت فارغ بود بشہرت محض آنکہ اورا عظیم الشان گاہ گاہ شریک مصلحت بعضی امور سلطنت می نمود و حکیم سلیم کہ از نوکران مقرب عظیم الشان گفتہ می شد براهنمائی او مقتول گردیدہ بود میر جملہ او را بطریق مہمان بخانہ طلبیدہ

M. L. II. 736, *l.* 4.

"And there is the still stranger story of a dervish named Shāh Qudratullāh. He had resigned his *manṣab* and retired from service. But because of a mere rumour [or report] that 'Aẓīmu-sh-Shān used occasionally to consult him about political matters and that Ḥakīm Salīm, a favourite servant of that prince, had been put to death in pursuance of his advice, Mīr Jumla invited him [Qudratullāh] to his house [one night and had him strangled in the morning]".

It is utterly absurd to talk of 'Aẓīmu-sh-Shān's having been killed at Ḥakīm Salīm's suggestion. The prince was drowned in the Rāvī. The person executed so treacherously and perfidiously by Mīr Jumla was the dervish Qudratullāh and not the Ḥakīm. And the charge against the dervish was that he had instigated the execution of the physician. But it may be pointed out that, elsewhere, Khwāfī Khān himself states, in connection with the execution of Farrukhsiyar's brother, prince Muḥammad Karīm, that though "Jahāndār Shāh was

unwilling to kill him, he was pursuaded by Ẕū-l-fiqār Khān and Shāh Kudrat Allāh Fakīr (may the curse of God be upon him) to put him to death" (E. D. VII. 432; text II. 689, *l.* 1). Mr. Irvine's account is that Mīr Jumla, who "had seen the extent of Qudratullāh's power and influence in 'Aẓīmu-sh-Shān's time, feared that this might be renewed in the case of the son "and destroy his own position". He got Farrukh-siyar to consent to his execution, alleging that the man was "a necromancer who had inveigled 'Aẓīmu-sh-shān by jugglery and incantations into his own net" (L. M. I. 279). Mīr Jumla appears to have been an unprincipled ruffian, of the type of man who floats to the surface in a decaying regime owing to his own extreme putrescence.

VII. 446, *l.* 13. *But wherever Nusrat Jang and Dāūd Khān went, the Mahrattas made their incursions, and levied the chauth.*

اما بدستور عمل نصرت جنگ و داؤد خان هر جاکہ دست آنہا میرسید
M. L. II. 737, *l.* 8 from foot. دار و مدار نموده چوتھ می گرفتند

"But wherever they were in great strength (lit. wherever their arm reached), they used to pursue a policy of give-and-take and exact the *chauth* in accordance with the standard or regulations of Nuṣrat Jang and (his deputy) Dāūd Khān".

دار و مدار literally means 'Hold and do not hold, keep and do not keep *i.e.* mutual concession, agreement, consultation and conciliation, compromise.'

VII. 448, *l.* 7. *They [the Sayyid brothers] went on a hunting excursion to the garden of Muhsin Khān ...... and he [Mīr Jumla] tried to stir the Emperor to seize them.*

It was not the Sayyids who went on the hunting excursion, but the emperor, who is said to have projected a visit to the garden of Muḥsin Khān (text, II. 739 last line). Elsewhere, Khwāfī Khān again states that whenever the emperor went out into the country round the capital to hunt, ... the rumour spread ...... that he had come out for the purpose of making Sayyid 'Abdullāh prisoner" (E. D. VII. 460 = text II. 771, *l.* 8 from foot).

The Siyaru-l-Mutākhirīn says that the emperor "formed the design of seizing 'Abdullāh Khān's person and frequently came out of the citadel under pretence of hunting or taking exercise in Mohsen Khān's gardens" (Tr. Briggs, 93).

VII. 450, *l.* 10. *For four or five months after the departure of the Amīru-l-umarā, there was a cessation of these exciting scenes.*

وکرین گفتگوهای فساد آمیز بعد رخصت امیرالامرا چهار پنج ماه در شهر و باره پلہ توقف واقع شد
M. L. II. 742, *l.* 11.

"And after the Amīru-l-Umarā had obtained from the emperor leave [to depart to the Dekkan], he halted for four or five months in the city [of Dehlī] and near the Bārahpulah", while these bickerings (lit. discord-breeding *pour parlers*) were going on". Mr. Irvine states that Ḥusain 'Alī Khān's audience of leave-taking رخصت took place on the 17th Ẕī-l-ḥijja 1126 H. but his first march was postponed till the 29th of Ṣafar, and his actual departure was not reported till the 30th Rabī' I 1127 H. The settlement of various points relating to his powers and the extent of his authority had caused a delay of three or four months which were spent by him at Bārahpola" (L. M. I. 303).

The Bārāpulah is a bridge of eleven arches about 4 miles to the south of Shāhjahānābād on the road to Farīdābād. It is said to have been built in 1021 H. by a lady named Āghā-i-Āghāyān who was the superintendent of Jahāngīr's harem (*Āṣār*, Pt. i. p. 27, *l.* 10). See also Faushawe, Delhi, 233. Bārah means 'twelve' but the actual number of spans is only eleven.

VII. 451, *l.* 8. *The enemy assembled twenty-three Kos from Aurangābād at a fort called Panāh-garhī, which they had built, as in other sūbas, as a place of refuge for themselves in their retreats.*

در ماه رجب سنهٔ سه از جلوس بیست و سه کروهی خجسته بنیاد کفار در پناه گڈهی که در انجا بدستور همه صوبجات برای ملجای فرار خود ساخته بودند جمع شدند
M. L. II. 743, *l.* 5 from foot.

It may be permissible to enter a caveat against 'panāh-garhī' being interpreted as the proper name of the place. The real meaning seems to be that the Mahrattas assembled and took shelter [پناه] in a *garhī* [گرهی] or *fort* which they had built as a place of refuge on a spot 23 *kos* distant from Aurangābād. The name of the place is not given.

Khwāfī Khān says elsewhere that the Mahrattas در هر صوبه یک دو گڈهی ساخته ملجای خود قرار داده از اطراف تاخت می آوردند (M. L. II. 517, *l.* 2 from foot) built in every *ṣūba* one or two *gadhīs* (forts) and having made them places of refuge, harried the districts from all sides". And in another place this identical collocation is used and he writes that the Mughal commanders بقصد پناه گڈهی

دندیری تعلقهٔ فوجداری قاسم خان جنگ کنان ... روانہ شده

M. L. II. 430, *l.* 3.

Both these passages will be found in Dowson's extracts on pp. 375 and 355.

Dowson speaks of the defeat of the Mahrattas and "the destruction of the *fort* by Niẓāmu-l-Mulk's followers" (*l.* 11). The corresponding words in the text are مسمار ساختن گدھی آن بدخصالان (II. 746, *l.* 8). This shows that 'Panāhgarhī' is not a place name.

VII. 451, *l.* 15. *Intelligence now arrived of the appointment of Amīru-l-umarā Husain 'Alī Khān to the Sūbadārī of the Dekhin, and of the despatch of a sanad appointing Najābat Khān Sūbadār of Burhānpūr for civil affairs and Haidar 'Alī Khān his dīwān for revenue matters.*

درهمین ایام خبر مقرر شدن صوبه‌داری دکن بنام امیرالامرا حسین علی خان و روانہ شدن سند نیابت..بنجابت خان صوبه‌دار برهانپور و تعلقهٔ مالی بنام حیدر قلی خان دیوان دکن از طرف حسین علی خان رسید

M. L. II. 750, *l.* 9.

"News now arrived of the appointment of Ḥusain 'Alī Khān as *Ṣubadār* of the Dekkan and of the despatch of one *sanad* appointing Najābat 'Alī Khān (the then Ṣūbadār of Burhānpūr), *as his deputy* and also of another *sanad* entrusting the department or control of all revenue affairs on behalf of Ḥusain 'Alī Khān to Ḥaidar Qulī Khān, the Dīwān".

Najābat Khān was not appointed Ṣūbadār of Burhānpūr, but the *nāib* or *locum-tenens* of Ḥusain 'Alī Khān as Ṣūbadār of *all the six ṣubas of the Dekkan* in the latter's absence. Ḥusain 'Alī was still at Dehlī.

VII. 452, *l.* 20. *Nīmā Sindhiā ...... having heard a report of Dāūd Khān's going to Ḥusain 'Alī and giving him his support had come with several other chiefs ...... so that at the proper time he might join the stronger party.*

نیبا سیندھیا کہ .... بشهرت استقبال حسین علی خان و اعانت داؤد خان که بر وقت کارزار رفاقت طرف غالب اختیار نماید مع چند تا سردار مرهتہ دیگر آمده

M. L. II. 751, *l.* 7 from foot.

"Nībā Recte Nemājī Sīndhiyā had come down with several other Marāṭhā Chiefs, ostensibly declaring that he was going to confront [or encounter] Ḥusain 'Alī Khān and assist Dāūd Khān, but [really] with a view to join, in the hour of trial, the predominent party".

Cf. S. M. 125. He was playing a subtle game, the motive of which was to back the side which would win and get the maximum advantages in return for the smallest sacrifices. See also Grant Duff, 169; Kincaid, II. 162.

VII, 455, *l.* 10. ***The Hindus ...... seized a lad of fourteen or fifteen years old the son of a cow butcher, and according to the statement of one of the citizens who fell into their hands, they ...... slaughtered him.***

هنود جرأت شوخی بمرتبه رسانند که پسر چهارده پانزده ساله گاوقصاب را
وبقولی یکی از آن بهرها را که بدست آنها افتاد کشیده گرفته مذبوح ساختند

M. L. II. 756, *l.* 2.

"The Hindus carried their audacity and impudence to such an extent that they dragged out and sacrificed the fourteen or fifteen years old son, of the cow-butcher (and according to one account) of one of the *Bohras*, who had fallen into their hands". The boy is said to have been the son of the very cow-butcher who had cut the throat of, and slaughtered the cow (گاو) in the manner prescribed by Muslim Law. As he could not be found, his son was dragged out of the house and killed, (S. M. Tr. Briggs, 99).

VII. 455, *l.* 20. ***The Afghāns of the suburbs and the inhabitants of the city assembled together.***

افغانان پورجات ... و بهرهاي شهرا جماع و غلوی عام نموده

M. L. II. 756, *l.* 8.

"The Afghāns of the suburbs of Aḥmadābād and the *Bohras* of the city having gathered together had formed riotous crowds. The Borahs بهرها are again mentioned in the text on p. 757, *l.* 4. They are also stated to have taken an active part on the side of the Muslims in the *Mirāt-i-Aḥmadī*. Its author speaks of them as بواهیر the Arabic plural of بوهره Bohra (Lith. 1307 A. H. p. 427, *l.* 12; 428, *l.* 6).

VII. 460, *l.* 13 from foot. ***Nizāmu-l-Mulk ...... was appointed Faujdār of Murādābād, to repress the disorder which reigned there.***

و نظام الملک بهادر فتح جنگ را خدمت فوجداري مرادآباد که بتقضاي
وقت برای دفع ایام فساد قبول نمود مقرر نمودند

M. L. II. 771, *l.* 10.

"And Niẓāmu-l-mulk Bahādur Fatḥ Jang was appointed to the *Faujdārī* of Murādābād which he accepted only because of the exigencies of the time and with a view to while away these days of disorder".

The post was not one worthy of him. He accepted it only because he could get nothing better. He was playing for time, waiting for the next turn in events during this period of strife and turmoil [دفع ایا فساد]

VII. 461, *l.* 13 from foot. *Intelligence now arrived from the Dakhin which found no place in the communications sent to court by Amīru-l-Umarā Husain 'Alī. He was appointing his own followers to the commands of the fortresses.*

بسبب رسیدن خبرهاي دکن کہ بفرستادهای حضور امیرالامرا دخل نمی داد
M. L. II. 773, *l.* 5.

"As reports now arrived from the Dekkan that the Amīru-l-Umarā did not allow those officers who had been appointed directly by His Majesty to take charge of their posts [enter upon and discharge their duties]".

Ḥusain 'Alī was within his rights in appointing his own castellans, as the emperor had consented to hand over his own power to him (E. D. VII. 45 = text II. 742, *l.* 7).

VII. 461, *l.* 9 from foot. *At court also, Rājā Ratan Chand ...... interfered with the appointments of the revenue officers, allowing them no certainty or security in their positions.*

بحضور راجہ رتن چند...در تعلقہ همہ متصدیان دخل نمود، احدی را اصلا اعتبار واستقلال نمیي داد خصوصا در مقدمات مالي کہ دیوان تن وخالصہ معطل محض بودند و پرگنات خالصہ بطریق اجاره درمعرض بیع وشرا لکها می آمد
M. L. II. 773, *l.* 7.

"At court, Rājā Ratan Chand interfered in the provinces of all the officials and deprived them of all authority and prestige and especially in matters relating to the revenue this was carried to such an extent that the *Dīwān-i-Tan* and the *Dīwān-i-Khāliṣa* were both rendered absolutely powerless and the *parganas* in the crown lands were given away by him on the farming system for *lakhs*".

VII. 466, *l.* 14. *So they simmered together like milk and sugar and matters went on without hitch or evasion.*

Dowson notes that the text says "with", but the context seems clear, but the text is quite right.

باهم چون شیر و شکر جوشیده بکجدار و مریز بعمل می آمد

M. L. II. 783, *l.* 9 from foot.

"So they simmered together like milk and sugar and the proverb, 'Hold awry but don't spill' was translated into action".

کجدار و مریز is explained in the *Ghiyāṣu-l-Lughāt* thus : احکامی کہ بجا اوردن آن دشوار باشد 'complying or appearing to comply with orders which it is all but impossible to carry out'. They were temporising, carrying on somehow for the time being in an impossible situation, pursuing a non-committal line of conduct.

VII. 468, *l.* 12. *Husain 'Alī Khān determined and issued strict injunctions that the rāhdārī should not be exacted, as in the days before the peace, from merchants and travellers at the rate of three (rupees) or four upon each bullock and cart, as faujdārs and harsh officials were acting.*

و تاکید می نمود کہ راهداري کہ بظلم فی ارابہ و گاو سہ برابر و چهار برابر نسبت
بفوجداران و حکام ظالم چنانچہ بگذارش آمده از بیوپاریان و مسافران در
ایام قبل از قرار صلح می گرفتند نگیرند
M. L. II. 785, *l.* 8 from foot.

The word 'rupees' is not in the text and its interpolation here perverts the real meaning. Khwāfī Khān is referring to the passage in which he has stated that the "*rāhdārs* of these evildoers (*i.e.* the Marāṭhās) used to take from small parties of merchants a toll upon every cart and bullock, *three or four times* greater than the amount imposed by the (most tyrranical) *faujdārs* of the (Mughal) government" (E. D. VII. 374, text II. 517).

What Ḥusain 'Alī Khān attempted to do was to put a stop to such extortionate charges which were not "three rupees or four upon each bullock and cart", but three or four times as high as the highest rate demanded by the most rapacious *faujdārs* of the old Mughal government. "And he issued peremptory orders that the *Rāhdārī* which used, as I have already stated, to be extorted per every cart from traders and wayfarers by the Marāṭhās at a rate three or four times as high as that demanded by the most tyrannical *faujdārs* and commanders of the Mughal government should not be exacted".

VII 468, *l.* 11 from foot. *Husain 'Alī delivered a sanad ...... to the Vakīls of Rājā Sāhū, and made no delay in writing for a royal farmān confirmatory of the document.*

براي طلب فرمان پادشاه مطابق سند خود موقوف نداشتم
M. L. II. 786, *l.* 2.

"He did *not* postpone the delivery of his own *sanad*, pending the application for the issue and receipt of an imperial farmān ratifying or confirming his grant".

He issued his own *sanad* at once, though he had no authority to do so and it was contrary to rules and regulations. He did not care to wait for the emperor's sanction, as he ought to have done. To say that he "made no delay in writing for a confirmatory farmān" is to turn the meaning topsy-turvy.

VII. 472, *l*, 8 from foot. *But on the second or third day after, Husain 'Alī heard from trustworthy and confidential correspondents, how the private talk was that the Emperor's proceedings were merely devices and snares that he was weaving to catch fools.*

اما روز دویم وسیم آن از زبان راوی ثقه و محرم راز حسین علی خان
مسموع گردید که در خلوت بر زبان آورد که این همه دام افسانه و افسون
ابله فریب که پادشاه می بافد عبث است

M. L. II. 801, *l*. 8.

"But on the second or third day after this speech, it was reported on the authority of trustworthy persons who were in the confidence of Ḥusain 'Alī Khān that in private he spoke thus : "All these hoodwinking snares and fool-deceiving devices which the emperor is weaving are sheer folly".

Cf. Irvine. "But in a day or two, persons in the confidence of Husain 'Alī Khān divulged the fact that privately he had expressed the opinion that this was [only a new plot hatched by Farrukhsiyar, that it was] absurd on the face of it......" (L. M. I. 368).

VII. 474, *l*. 6. *On the 9th Rabī'u-l-ākhir 1131 A. H. ...... Rafī'u-d-Darajāt was made Emperor.*

The Ilāhī date is given as 10th Isfandār and the week-day as Wednesday in the text (815, *l*. 6). 9th Rabī' II. 1131 H. was Wednesday, 18th February 1719 A. D. (O. S.). 10th Isfandārmad would be just 20 days before 10th March, *i.e.* 18th February. This proves that the correct year must have been 1131 H. and not 1132 H.

VII. 478, *l*. 6. *The people were desirous to get a message sent in by artifice to Farrukhsiyar.*

هرچند خواستند که پادشاه را بافسانه و افسون پیام از محل بر آرند فائده
نه بخشید و کنیزان حبشی و ترکی مستعد جنگ شدند

M. L. II. 813 last line.

It was not the people, but the Sayyid 'Abdullāh and his partisans who were sending messages calculated to deceive the emperor and induce him to quit the sanctuary of the harem and come out, so that they could deal with him as they chose (L. M. I. 386). It was only when they failed to decoy him by these means, that they entered the harem by force and "after much search" dragged him out of the corner of the roof "in which he was hidden".

VII. 478, *l.* 4 from foot. ***The troublous reign of Farrukhsiyar lasted for six years and four months, without counting the eleven months of the reign of Jahāndār, which were reckoned as part of his reign, and so entered in the royal records.***

Farrukhsiyar defeated Jahāndār on the 13th of Ẕī-l-ḥijja 1124 H. and was deposed on the 9th of Rabī' II. 1131 H. He reigned for 6 years, 3 months and 25 days. Khwāfī Khān has got it right here, but elsewhere he has made a terrible mess of the chronology of the reign of the emperor. See my Historical Studies in Mughal Numismatics 281–2 and L. M. I. 398.

VII. 482, *l.* 7 from foot. ***He [Rafī'u-d-darajāt] had reigned six months and ten days.***

Correctly, *three* months and ten days سه ماه و ده روز as in the text (830, *l.* 2). Rafī'u-d-darajāt ascended the throne, as Dowson himself states (p. 479), on 9th Rabī'u-l-ākhir 1131 H. (p. 479) and abdicated or made room for his brother, who was installed on the 19th or 20th of Rajjab 1131 H. (L. M. I. 420).

VII. 482, *l.* 3 from foot. ***On the 20th of Rajab 1131 A. H. (27th May 1719 A. D.) Rafī'u-d-daula was raised to the throne.***

Here also, the Ilāhī synchronism is given as 17th Khurdād (831, *l.* 5). This is the 79th day of the Ilāhī year and must be equivalent to the 149th (79 + 70) day of the Julian year *i.e.* the 29th of May. The equivalent of 20th Rajjab 1131 H. was, according to the book-rule, 28th May 1719 A. D. But 20th Rajjab 1132 H. corresponded to 17th May 1720 A. D. We may be therefore sure that the correct year is 1131 H. and not 1132 H.

VII. 485, *l.* 9. ***Shāh Jahān, the Second, died of dysentery and mental disorder.***

The words in the text are بازار اسہال و مرض روحانی (II. 838, *l.* 4 from foot). "Mental disorder" conveys an impression very different from what was intended by the author. The poor puppet does not appear to have been insane or out of his mind. مرض روحانی probably signifies only weariness and 'vexation of the spirit, tribulation of the soul, intense depression and despair'. Khwāfī Khān means that his death was partly due to his bondage. He died of grief or anguish of the heart. Iron had entered into his soul. The proximate cause of his demise is stated to have been diarrhoea, which proved unamenable to treatment as he was an opium addict (Irvine, L. M. I. 431).

VII. 492, *l.* 10 from foot. *Mahbūb Khān otherwise called 'Abdu-n-Nabī Kashmīrī had a long standing enmity against the Hindus of Kashmīr.*

The title is given as Maḥtavī Khān, محتوی خان in the M. U. III. 764, *l.* 3 from foot and 765, *l.* 2. as well as in a history of Kashmīr, called واقعات کشمیر and written by Muḥammad A'ẓam in 1160 H. (Mullā Fīrūz Library MS; Rehatsek's Catalogue IV). See also Newall's abridged translation of this work in J. A. S. B. 1854, Pt. I. The name is spelt 'Mohtevy' in Briggs' trans. of the S. M. 214, 218, 219.

VII. 493, *l.* 12 from foot. *Mīr Shāhūr Khān.*

Sic. in the B. I. text II. 868, *l.* 11, but the *Maāṣiru-l-Umarā* has 'Shāhpūr Khān' (III. 764, *l.* 10) and the *Wāqi'āt-i-Kashmīr* reads the name in the same way.

VII. 494, *l.* 6 from foot. *Mahbūb Khān went to the house of Shāhūr Khān, and having made a statement to him rose to depart alleging he had some necessary business to attend to.*

The person who "rose to depart" was not Maḥbūb (Maḥtavī) Khān, but the Bakhshī Shāhpūr Khān.

محبوب خان.... بخانۂ میر شاهور خان رفت بعد مکالمۂ چند کلام صاحب خانم
بهانۂ شغل ضروری برخاست

M. L. II. 870, *l.* 5.

"Maḥbūb Khān went to the house of Mīr Shāh(p)ūr Khān. After some conversation, the master of the house rose on the pretext of some necessary business".

The "master of the house" was the *Bakhshī*, in whose house and at whose instigation the bigot was assassinated. He had entered into

a plot with the governor and left the room at a concerted signal on some pretext, so that the man might be despatched in his absence.

VII. 494, *l.* 2 from foot. *The Charbelī and Kahkarān quarters of the city.*

The *Maāṣiru-l-Umarā* reads the first name as جدی ملی or چڈی ملی (III. 764, *l.* 3 from foot, 765, *l.* 2). In the Mullā Fīrūz Library manuscript of the *Wāqi'āt-i-Kashmīr*, the second name is written جدبیل or حدبیلی The S. M. has Judbel (tr. Briggs, 219).

'Kahkarān' should be read as *Gakkharān*, the street or quarter inhabited by the Gakkhars.

VII. 500, *l.* 7 from foot. *There was a strong disinclination to entering the service of the two brothers, and the amīrs who had received orders to accompany Husain 'Alī Khān, had received orders to raise squadrons, so men and horses were scarce.*

Here again, the real meaning is put upside down. What the author himself writes is

چون هنگامهٔ نوکری در سرکار هر دو برادر گرم گردیده بود

M. L. II. 897, *l.* 5 from foot.

As both the brothers were competing for recruits and the recruiting-officers of the *amīrs* who were under orders to accompany Ḥusain 'Alī as his auxiliaries were also briskly enlisting eligible men, the market of the service of the brothers was very *warm* and prices were at a premium. Men and horses were scarce [کمیاب], because the demand from so many quarters was so great that it was in excess of the available supplies. So at p. 510, Dowson says that "the eagerness to enter the service" of the Sayyids was so great that "one horse (*Yābū*) would receive the *dāgh* (brand) two or three times".

کوری چشم means "so that ill-wishers and enemies are blinded *with* envy".

Khwāfī Khān uses the idiom elsewhere and states that on the very day on which Shivājī arrived in Āgra, fourteen hundred carts, each drawn by eight bullocks, and loaded with gold *muhrs* and rupees, and vessels of gold and silver, which belonged to the emperor's *Khazāna*, arrived from Dehlī and passed through the gates of the fort, to the کوری چشم of that infidel and other enemies of the house of Tīmūr.

در همین روزها هزار و چهار صد ارابهٔ هشت گاوی پر از اشرفي، و روپیه و ظروف طلا و نقره و مرصع الات بکوری چشم آن کافر و دیگر مخالفان و معاندان خاندان صاحب قرآن داخل قلعهٔ اکبرآباد گردید

M. L. II. 189 last line.

He means that sight of this enormous wealth must have made Shivājī blind with envy.

VII. 501, *l.* 14 from foot. *Although we know that we shall suffer many hardships through the downfall of the Bārhas, still we hope that, through the blindness of its ill-wishers, the house of Tīmūr may again acquire splendour.*

معهذا آرزو داریم که بکوري چشم بدخواهان دولت صاحب قرآن سلطنت دودمان تیموریه از سر نو رونق پذیرد

M. L. II. 900, *l.* 5 from foot.

"Nevertheless, we wish that the empire of the descendants of Tīmūr will still regain its former glory to the confusion and disappointment of the ill-wishers of the family of that Lord of Conjunctions".

VII. 501, *l.* 8 from foot. *Woe to all Bārha Saiyids, for we know what evil awaits our children through the misdeeds of these two men.*

The Bibl. Ind. text inserts a negative. According to it, what they said was:

نمیي دانیم که از شامت اینها مآل کار اولاد ما بکجا خواهد رسید

M. L. II. 901, *l.* 1.

"We do *not* know to what dismal lengths the miserable affairs of our children will go, on account of the misconduct of these men".

VII. 502, *l.* 14. *So I'timādu-d-daula was always scheming the overthrow of the Bārhas, but he did not think it prudent to seek assistance of his friends and acquaintances in this dangerous project.*

بي مدد رفیق شفیق در چنان امر خطیر اقدام نمودن صلاح کار نمیدانست

M. L. II. 902, *l.* 11.

"But he did not think it advisable to take any steps [or to take the initiative] in such hazardous enterprise *without* the co-operation of faithful friends".

VII. 502, *l.* 2 from foot. ***On the 6th Zī-l-hijja, in the second year of the reign (1132 H.), Husain 'Alī Khān was assassinated.***

Here also the Ilāhī date is recorded as 16th Mihr. The Julian equivalent of both was 29th September 1720 A. D. (O. S.). 16th Mihr is the 203rd day of the Ilāhī year and the 273rd (203 + 70) of the Julian, *i.e.* 29th September (O. S.) or 10th October (N. S.) (L. M. II. 58).

VII. 505, *l.* 3. ***The Nawāb Kudsiya (the emperor's mother), in her motherly love, forbade the entrance of the brave Sa'ādat Khān.***

نواب قدسیه از راه مهر مادري مانع بر آمدن آن مهر سپهر وقار بود

M. L. II. 906, *l.* 8 from foot.

"The Nawāb Qudsiya, who on account of her motherly love, was anxious to prevent the coming out of that sun of heavenly glory, *i.e.* the emperor".

It was not the entrance of Sa'ādat Khān which she forbade. It was the *exit* of the young emperor from the harem. She did not want to expose his person to danger in the midst of the emeute. Sa'ādat Khān wanted the young emperor to come out and put himself at the head of his party, with a view to rally round him all those who were loyal to the imperial family and opposed to the usurpation of power and authority by the Sayyids. When he assured the begam that there was really no danger to her son's person, بعد خاطر جمعی از شر مخافه ن (M. L. II. 906, *l.* 7 from fooot) he was allowed to enter and succeeded in persuading Muḥammad Shāh to go out with him (Irvine, L. M. II, 60–61).

VII. 506, *l.* 2 from foot. ***He received a kror and fifty lacs of rupees as inām.***

Not 'rupees' but *dāms* یک کرور وپنجاه لک دام as in the text, 911, *l.* 7 and also *M. U.* I. 349, *l.* 6 from foot. The unit of the currency was the *dām* and the value of all emoluments and gifts was reckoned in *dāms*. An *in'ām* of one *kror* and a half of *rupees* would be unthinkable in the dwindling state of the finances of the empire. The S. M. puts the amount at "two crores and a half of *dāms*" (Tr. Briggs, 253).

VII. 508, *l.* 13. *Sarāī of Jahāna.*

This is really the sarāī of Chhāta چھاتہ. The name has been transformed almost beyond recognition, as the copyist has missed out two dots below the first letter and one above the fourth.

Chhata or Chhāta is now in the Muttra district, and lies about sixty-eight miles south of Dehlī and forty-eight miles north-west of Āgra. The place and its great sarāī are mentioned in most of the old intineraries (*Chihār Gulshan* in I. A. XCVII and XCVIII; Constable, Pl. 27 Cb; I. G. Atlas, 31 A 3).

It is now a station on the Central Railway, seventy miles from Dehlī junction.

VII. 508, *l.* 16. *Shujā'at 'Alī Khān.*

Read 'Shujā'atullāh Khān' as in the text (II. 913, *l.* 2). He is styled 'Shujā'atullāh' by Dowson himself, when he is mentioned again on p. 509. He was the son-in-law of Sayyid 'Abdullāh Khān (L. M. II. 67).

VII. 509, *l.* 11. *On the 9th Zī-l-hijja, 1132 (1st October, 1720 A. D.) Sultān Muhammad Ibrāhīm was raised to the throne.*

11th Ẓī-l-ḥijja in the B. I. text II. 914, *l.* 12. The *Tārīkh-i-Muẓaffarī* (MS. 108, *l.* 1) and the *Siyaru-l-Mutākhhirīn* (Tr. I. 186) agree with the B. I. text of Khwāfī Khān in putting the accession on the 11th.

But Mr. Irvine gives 15th Ẓī-l-ḥijja (L. M. II. 76). یازدهم and پانزدهم are so very much alike in Persian writing, that it is impossible to say which is correct, when the week-day also is not categorically stated. See my H. S. M. N. 286. 9th Ẓī-l-ḥijja is demonstrably wrong, as the princes are stated to have been approached and the offer first made to them on the Id-i-Qurbān, *i.e.* the 10th.

VII. 511, *l.* 13. *Notwithstanding all the lavish distribution of the money which had been collected by carts-full from house to house.*

که باوجود این همه زر پاشی که پر از ارابها خانه بخانه فراخوار قسمت ......
بخرج در آمد

M. L. II. 919, *l.* 11.

"Notwithstanding the squandering of all this money which was spent and cartloads of which were distributed from house to house proportionately (to requirements)".

VII. 511, *l.* 15 from foot. *And at last money for the pay of ten days of Muharram was somehow raised, and they could not get the balance.*

آخر ده روزه منجمله طلب ماه محرم بجمعی کم وسیله داشتند رسید
باقی از آن محروم ماندند
M. L. II. 919, *l.* 6 from foot.

"At last those who had influence received pay for only ten days of Muḥarram, instead of the full amount that was due for the month and the rest (those who had no influence, no one to befriend them) did not get even so much".

VII. 511, *l.* **9 from foot.** *On the 19th Muharram, the royal army encamped at Shāhpūr.*

نهم دهم ninth-tenth, in the text II. 920, *l.* 1, and this must be the correct date as the 12th is mentioned on the page following. There, 17th (*l.* 13 from foot) also is an error for 13th (text II. 923, *ll.* 8, 6 from foot). Intelligence of the fall of the Bārhas' rule is said to have reached Dehli on the 14th (p. 515). Cf. Irvine (L. M. II. 82), who says that the emperor's camp was moved to Shāhpūr on the 11th and to Ḥasanpūr on the 12th. The battle took place on the 13th (*Shāhnāma-i-Munavvar-al-kalām* quoted in Rieu, Catalogue, I. 274; Irvine, *loc. cit* II. 85–93, and the authorities quoted there. See also the S. M. Trans. Briggs, p. 265).

VII. 517, *l.* **20.** *In the latter days of Rabī'u-l-ākhir 1133 A. H., Muhammad Amīn Khān Chīn died.*

در عشرهٔ ثانی ربیع الاخر (II. 939, *l.* 6) ***i.e.*** in the *second decade* of Rabī' II ***i.e.*** between the 11th and 20th. So also for "the latter part of Rabī'u-l-ākhir" on *l.* 4 from foot of this page, it would be more correct to say "in the second decade of the month of Rabī'u-l-ākhir", as the same words are used in the original (II. 939, *l.* 15).

Mr. Irvine says Muḥammad Amīn Khān Chīn died on 27th January 1721 A. D. (N. S.) (L. M. II. 104), which would correspond to 28th Rabī' I. 1133 H. according to the Indian Ephemeris. There must be a mistake somewhere. The S. M. gives the Hijra date as 29th Rabī'u-l-awwal 1133 (Briggs, trans. 281).

VII. 525, *l.* **1.** *Upon the excuse of needing change of air, he went thirty or forty kos from the capital to the side of the Ganges. There he hunted and recruited his health.*

The name of the *Shikārgāh* is given as 'Soron' سورون in the text (II. 949, *l.* 3 from foot). Soron is even now a well-known health-resort. It is in the Etah district, U. P. (I. G. Atlas, 31 B. 3).

VII. 527, *l*. 8. *Khwāja Ahmad Khān ...... who had been left as deputy in charge of Haidarābād, had gone into the fortress of Muhammadnagar, near the city.*

This is the name of the fortress or citadel of Golkoṇḍa. It is said to have been so called by Sulṭān Qulī Quṭb Shāh, the first of the independent rulers of Golkoṇḍa, after his patron, Muḥammad Shāh Bahmanī (Briggs, Firishta, III. 353 and note).

VII. 530, *l*. 4. *Sarbuland Khān refused to admit him (Dūngarsingh) and prepared to resist him by force of arms. So he fled and for some days no trace was found of him.*

This is manifestly inconsequential. The text has the words, آخر نتوانست II. 971, *l*. 5 from foot, "but at last, he [Sarbuland] was unable to do so". These words should be inserted between 'arms' and 'so'. See L. M. II. 203, 206, 209.

VII. 538, *l*. 3. *A'zam Shāh proceeded ...... towards Āgra ...... taking the route by the ghāt of Tūmrī.*

This is 'Tūmrī' now in the state of Bhopal, about sixteen miles north of Nīmāwar, which lies opposite to Handiya on the Narmadā. The usual route was to the left of Burhānpūr and by the ferry of Akbarpūr on the Narmadā. A'ẕam Shāh turned to the right and marched via Pendhār six *kos* from Burhānpūr, through the Tumrī Ghāṭ. This route was shorter, but more difficult as the pass is long, narrow and water-less and numbers of men are said to have perished from thirst during the two marches in which it was crossed (Irvine L. M. I. 12 and note).

VII. 548, *l*. 11 from foot. *First, because my father, on a mere suspicion of disloyalty, kept me nine years in close confinement.*

This is fairly, though not precisely, correct. Khwāfī Khān states in his slipshod way that Muḥammad Mu'aẕẕam was arrested in the 29th and released in the 39th year of Aurangzeb's reign (text 332, *l*. 10; 437, *l*. 2 from foot=E. D. VII. 327, 358), after having been "kept under arrest" for seven (*sic*) years. According to the *Maāṣir-i-'Ālamgīrī*, the prince was put under restraint on 18th Rabī' II, 1098 H.=21st February 1687 A. D. (O. S.) and finally restored to liberty and sent as governor of Āgra on 9th Shawwāl 1106 H. (13th May, 1695 A. D.) that is, after eight lunar years and six months. But this was done only

after applying various tests, one after another, and closely watching the prince's reactions to them. The curious history of the gradual relaxation of the rigour of his captivity may be read in the *M. A.* 335, 341, 351, 370–3; Sarkar H. A. IV. 364–365; Irvine L. M. I. 3 and note; Khwāfī Khān II. 397-8, 404, 407, 437, 443.

VII, 561, *l.* 19. *On the night of the 13th Zī-l-ka'da ...... the Saiyids ...... crossed the river ...... and a little after mid-day the battle began.*

The month is wrongly stated. Khwāfī Khān gives 13th Ẓī-l-ḥijja (text II. 701, *l.* 7 from foot). Dowson makes it 16th in his translation (E. D. VII. 437), but that is because he has misread سیزدهم as شنزدهم. The date of the battle is given as 13th Ẓī-l-ḥijja 1124 H. in L. M. I. 229 also.

VII. 565, *l.* 9 from foot. *On the third day after it (scil. the news of Aurangzeb's death) became known in Delhī, on the 21st Ẓī-l-ka'da, 1118, of the holy Hijra...... after sunset, such a noise arose on the west as might be taken as a sample of the noise there will be at the day of judgment.*

It is strange that this author should make a mistake about the date of an event so notable, if not epochmaking, as the demise of Aurangzeb. The correct date was the *28th* of Ẓī-l-qa'da. The news probably reached Dehlī about twenty days afterwards on the 18th of Ẓī-l-ḥijja, and the earthquake (?) *might have* taken place on the 21st of *Ẓī-l-ḥijja i.e.* on the *twenty-third* day after the day of Aurangzeb's death.

VII. 567, *l.* 12. *The son of 'Ālī Jāh was 'Ālī Tabār.*

Irādat Khān says 'Ālī Tabār was the son of A'ẓam Shāh, the son of Aurangzeb (E. D. VII. 552), and Khwāfī Khān also has exactly the same statement (text II. 496, *l.* 4 from foot, 498, *l.* 6). Mr. Irvine makes 'Ālī Tabār the tenth and youngest son of A'ẓam Shāh (L. M. I. 35). 'Shāh 'Ālī jāh' was a title bestowed on his third son 'A'ẓam by Aurangzeb on 31st July 1681 A. D. (Sarkar H. A. III. 56).

VOL. VIII. MUHAMMAD SHĀH TO SHĀH 'ĀLAM II.

VIII. 46, *l.* 13 from foot. *Chatrasāl fled for refuge to the Zemīndārs of Jharna and Parna and the whole territory came into the possession of the Khān.*

Both these place-names are so wrongly spelt as to be almost beyond recognition. 'Jharna' is, most probably, an error for 'Ajhnar' (six miles south of Jaitpūr) to the hills of which Chhatrasāl is said to have fled (Irvine, Later Mughals, II. 233). See also his article in J. A. S. B. 1878, on the 'Bangash Nawābs of Farrukhābād', p. 295 and note.

VIII. 47, *l.* 15. *'Abdullāh Khān and Zuhūrullāh Khān ...... who had fled away towards Shamsābād-Maū ...... collected eight thousand men of the Rohilla tribe, and advanced towards that city.*

There are several places called Shamsābād and also several named Maū. This Shamsābād is near the old town of Khor. It lies about 15 miles N. W. of Farrukhābād, the capital of the Bangash Nawwābs. Lat. 27°–32′ N. 79°–30′ E. (Thornton). Maū lies about five miles west of Shamsābād. It is also called Maū-Rashīdābād (Irvine, J. A. S. B. 1878, p. 269). The river Garra (*l.* 10 from foot) is a tributary of the Western Rāmagaṅgā. The towns of Pīlībhīt and Shāhjahānpūr in Rohilkhaṇd are both situated on its left bank.

VIII. 48, *l.* 8 from foot. *In this year (1142 H. = 1729 A. D.), in the month of Sha'bān, a great tumult arose in the Jāmi'a Masjid, to avenge the death of a Musulman who was slain by a Hindu of the name of Subhkaran.*

This is what is known as the "Shoe-sellers' riot". It "occupies a considerable space", says Mr. Irvine, "in all the histories of the time; and besides its value as a picture of the turbulence of the capital, it is important as conducing to the downfall of the group of palace favourites (the Kokī, Ḥafiẓ Khidmatgār Khān, Roshan-ud-daulah Ẓafar Khān etc. whose influence was all powerful on the Emperor's mind through-out the first twelve or thirteen years of his reign" (L. M. II. 257 et seq).

VIII. 76, *l.* 5. *No account of the book [Tazkira of Ānanda Rāma Mukhlis] has been found among Sir H. M. Elliot's papers, and there is no copy of the work in his library.*

The manuscript used by Lieut. Perkins for the translations here given is now in the 'Alīgarh University Library. It ends with the last year of Muḥammad Shāh's reign (1748 A. D.) (Sarkar, Fall of the Mughal Empire, I. p. 9).

VIII. 77, *l.* 10. *Accordingly, on the 8th of Safar, in the twentieth year of Muḥammad Shāh's reign, A. H. 1150, the Persian Emperor set his face towards Kābul, where he arrived towards the end of the month.*

The year is erroneously stated. It should be 1151 H. (Tārīkh-i-Jahān-Kusha-i-Nādirī = T. K. J. N. Lith. 322–323; Later Mughals, II. 326–7). The *Siyaru-l-Mutākhirīn* also puts the invasion wrongly into 1150 H. (Tr. Briggs, 418).

VIII. 79 *l.* 7. *The Emperor, with his own hands, bound on the heads of the chiefs a mālāband of Burhānpūr workmanship.*

Read 'bālāband' بالابند. The word means 'turban'. Burhānpūr was famous for its manufactures of "very transparent muslins", white and coloured which were exported in great quantities to Persia, Turkey, Muscovie, Poland, Arabia and other places in the time of Tavernier (Travels, Tr. Ball, I. 51).

VIII. 80, *l.* 6 from foot. *He was courteously received and presented with a Chapkan of gold brocade.*

A چپکن or چپکن is a sort of short coat. The word is spelt in various ways and is probably, identical with the چکمن which Abū-l-Fazl says was made of broad cloth or woollen cloth (*Āīn*. tr. I. 96). Vullers gives it as *chaspan* (*Ibid.* note).

VIII. 98, *l.* 8 from foot. *Khudāyār Khān 'Abbāsī was dismissed with a present of a horse to his home on the 15th of Muharram A. H. 1152 (12th April, 1739 A.D.).*

The year is stated wrongly. Read 15th Muḥarram 1153 H. (T. K. J. N. Lith. 375, *l.* 12). The Julian equivalent would be 1st April, 1740 A. D. Nādir Shāh left Delhī for Afghānistān on 7th Ṣafar, 1152 H. = 5th May, 1739 A. D., crossed the Chināb on 7th Rabī' II, 1152 H. = 3rd July 1739 A. D., and reached Kābul on 1st Ramaẓān 1152 H. He left Kābul again for Sind on 7th Ramaẓān, arrived at Lārkhāna on the 14th of Ẓī-l-qa'da and at Amarkot on the 9th of Ẓī-l-ḥijja. He returned to Lārkhāna again on the 16th of the same month and started for Nādirābād on the 13th of Muḥarram 1153 H. (*Ibid.* 362, 363, 366, 368-371, 375).

VIII. 100, *l.* 13. *The title of the work may, perhaps, be derived from the name assumed by Nādir Shāh on his entering the service of Shāh Tahmāsp.*

The suggestion is uncalled for and rests on nothing but the illusory resemblance of the names. The work contains, literally and factually, the memoirs or reminiscences of the author, whose name was Ṭahmāsp Khān and who bore the titles of Muḥkamu-d-daula, I'tiqādjang also. It appears to have been written in 1193 H. (Rieu, IV, 980, MS. No. 1918).

VIII. 108, *l.* 15. *On Friday, the 21st of Rabī'u-l-awwal (1161 A. H.), when three or four gharīs of the day had passed, he (Abdalī Shāh) opened fire from his guns.*

This is the date of the battle of 'Sirhind or Mānūpūr'. It was Thursday, 10th March 1748 A. D., according to the book-rule. If the week-day has been given correctly, 21st must have been the *Hilālī* or *Rūyyat* date. The battle was really fought on the 11th of March (Sarkar, Fall of the Mughal Empire, I. 222).

VIII. 111, *l.* 7. *He [Muḥammad Shāh] was one day carried in a litter to the Masjid-i-Sangī Gate.*

The correct name is Masjid-i-*Sangīn*, the Mosque of Stone.

VIII. 147, *l.* 6. *After attacking and plundering certain Jāts, he [Aḥmad Shāh Abdālī] crossed the river Jumna, and took up his quarters at Sābit-Kasra for the hot weather.*

This is, as I have pointed out in S. I. M. H. Vol. I. p. 691 an error for Ṣābitgarh an old name of 'Alīgarh. The name is derived from Ja'far Beg Ṣābit Khān, who was governor here. Two Persian inscriptions in 'Alīgarh town bear witness to his having built a mosque in 1137-1141 H. and of his having erected the mausoleum of a saint named Allāh Bakhsh in 1129 H. Proc. A. S. B. 1872, p. 167, Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica (1909–10), p. 48.

VIII. 193, *l.* 11 from foot. *Mr. Blochmann says, it looks as if Amīr Haidar Husainī Bilgrāmī's copy of the fourth part of the Inshā-i-Abū-l-Fazl was unique.*

But a reference made by Sir H. Elliot on p. 413, Vol. V of this work, shows that he had access to this rare portion of the work.

This 'fourth part' seems to have been a collection of private letters addressed by Abū-l-Faẓl to his father, his brother Faiẓī and other

friends and acquaintances. There is a copy of it in the India Office Library. See my note to E. D. V. 413 in S. I. M. H. Vol. I. 546.

VIII. 205, *l.* 19. *The compiler [Hari Charan Dās] says he carefully went through ...... Faiẓī's translation of the Jog Bashist from Sanskrit into Persian.*

The compiler must be mistaken in ascribing the translation to Faiẓī. Abū-l-Faẓl gives the names of the Sanskrit works translated by the orders of Akbar and speaks in his stilted way of the *Lilāvatī* having "lost its Hindu veil and received a Persian garb from the hand of my elder brother"; but he says nothing of any Persian version of the *Yoga Vāsishṭha* by Faiẓī, or any one else (*Āīn.* Tr. I. reprint, 112). The oldest Persian translation of this work is an anonymous one made from an abridgment of the Kāshmīrian Paṇḍita Ānandana, the date of which is not known. Another was undertaken in 1006 H.—two years after Faiẓī's death—at the desire of Akbar. The third was composed under the auspices of the prince Dārā Shikoh (Rieu, Catalogue, I. 62; Ethé, India Office Catalogue). But though no systematic translation of this work is extant or was made by him, he does appear to have composed or compiled a "treatise in Persian on the Vedānta philosophy, based on Sanskrit sources, for instance, the *Yoga Vāsishṭha*, the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* and others", which is entitled شارق المعرفت. It is probably, the work read and referred to by this author (Ethé. I. O. C. MS. No. 1975, Col. 1101, E. G. Browne, Cambridge Catalogue, p. 95). Only it is not easy to see why this writer "carefully went through" an abstruse metaphysical lucubration for putting together a historical synopsis.

VIII. 207, *l* 16. *Thirty Rājas of this line ruled from Judhishtar during a period of 1739 years, 3 months and 16 days.*

As this list of 'thirty Rājas' is again transcribed in the bibliographical notice of another equally worthless compilation on p. 357, as if it were a historical document, it may be necessary to warn the incautious reader that it is absolutely mythical. Thirty rulers in 1739 years would yield an average of fifty-eight years to a reign! The normal average is eighteen. Then 94 kings belonging to 12 other dynasties are said to have reigned for about 2330 years.

VIII. 212, *l.* 11. *Ja'far 'Alī Khān put him [Sirāju-d-daula] to death in 1160 A. H. (1747 A. D).*

This is ten years too early. It is strange that this otherwise well informed author should be guilty of such a lapse.

VIII. 258, *l*. 4. *Be it not hidden that in the language of the people of the Dakhin, these territories are called 'Dihast'.*

Properly, 'deshasta' says Dowson, in his note. But the correct restoration is *Desha* (دیش). The vocable which the author has in mind and is attempting to transliterate is this Marāṭhī word implying 'territory above Western Ghāṭs'. 'Deshastha is an inhabitant of the *Desha*. Dowson has misunderstood Grant Duff. What he says is, "the Ghautmatha is succeeded by open country or 'Desh', which generally becomes more and more level to the eastward" (H. M. p. 4). Elsewhere, he explains that the 'Deshist' Brahmins are those who belong to the territory above the Ghauts (*Ibid*. p. 5).

VIII. 275, *l*. 17. *On Tuesday, the 9th of Zī-l-hijja 1173 A. H. (23rd Sept. 1760 A. D.)...... he [Bhāo] enjoyed the felicity of beholding the fort of Dehlī.*

This was really 23rd *July*, not September, 1760 A. D. On p. 277 Dowson states that 4th Ẕī-l-ḥijja 1173 H. was 18th *July* 1760 A. D.

VIII. 305, *l*. 21. *Hāfiz Rahmat ...... took leave of Shujāu-d-daula and General Parkar and went to Pīlībhīt.*

Correctly, Sir Robert Barker (Keene, Fall of the Mughal Empire, Edit. 1876, p. 102; Strachey, Hastings and the Rohilla War, pp. 53, 56).

VIII. 311, *l*. 21. *The alarm of war having spread, numbers of Afghāns from Maū and Farrukhābād ...... gathered round Hāfiz Rahmat.*

This is Maū-Rashīdābād, *q. v.* note on VIII. 47, *l*. 15 in this volume. p. 445.

VIII. 318, *l*. 7. *Malhār Rāo [Holkar] took the opportunity of asking for Khāndesh and Khānpūr, which were old dependencies of Aurangābād.*

I cannot find any well-known town answering to Khānpūr in this part of the country. In a copy of the *Tārīkh-i-Muẓaffarī* belonging to me, the name is written جال پور which is equally unrecognizable. Perhaps the right reading is جالناپور Jālnāpūr, the old name of Jālnā, *q. v.* E. D. VI. 102; VII. 11, which lies about forty miles east of Aurangābād.

VIII. 334, *l*. 8. ***Alīwardī Khān Turkomān ...... was the inventor of a new mode of hunting styled Tūrkalānī.***

As Mu'tamid Khān says in the *Iqbālnāma* (text, 272, *l*. 6), that this net was called 'Bāwar' in Hindī, it has been suggested by Mr. Irvine that the true reading must be بورکلانی. But تورکلانی is quite correct. Bābur writes thus: "Next morning, I mounted and went and threw a net for fish" (Memoirs Tr. Erskine 284 = Mrs. Beveridge's tr. B. N. 424). The word used is *Tūra*, a 'fishing net', in the Turkī as well as in the Persian version. The *Ghiyāṣu-l-Lughāt* also states that تور is used for 'a fishing net' (دام ماهی) in Turkī.

VIII. 367, *l*. 10. ***Ranjit Singh professed allegiance to Sindhia Patel.***

This is Mahādajī Sindhia who was proud of being addressed as 'Paṭel', as his ancestors had been *Paṭels* of the village of Kaṇher-Kheḍ, which lies about fifteen miles east of Sātāra (Grant Duff, H. M. reprint 1873, p. 212).

Mr. H. G. Keene observes that the affectation of this rural dignity was a stroke of policy in Sindhia's case, though not a very deep one (Fall of the Mughal Empire, Edit. 1876, p. 90 note).

VIII. 372, *l*. 5 from foot. *The "Revealer of News" (Kāshiful Akhbār) was composed by 'Ināyet Husain of Mahrard for the instruction of his son.*

No such place as 'Mahrard' is known. The author's ***nisbah*** is مرهروی or مارهروی ***i. e.*** of Marharavī or Mārharavī, an old town in the Etah district (Constable, 27 Db). We should read *wāv* not *dāl*.

VIII. 377, *l*. 15. ***The Rājāvalī of Bhāu Rām.***

Some one possessing more imagination than knowledge appears to have set afloat the surmise that this work is so called because its author's ***takhalluṣ*** was Rājā Walī. But the title of the book is, in fact, only a Hindī word, formed like *vanshāvalī* (genealogy), ***prashnāvalī*** (questionnaire), ***muktāvalī*** (string of pearls), ***ratnāvalī*** (necklace of jewels). ***Rājāvalī*** signifies 'list of kings'. The name of the author has not been ascertained with anything like certainty. Some say that the lists of kings and the tables were originally drawn up by Banwālīdās, a Munshī of the prince Dārā Shikōh, and that the work was continued or completed by a later author down to 'Ālamgīr II. Others ascribe the compilation to "Raṇjitsiṅgh, a Munshī of the celebrated Āṣaf Jāh, Ṣūbadār of the Deccan" (Rieu, B. M. C. 855, 916; Ethé, J. O. L. C.

Cols. 87–88, Nos. 205–6). There is a similar compilation entitled *Rāj Sohāvalī* (Ethé, Col. 88–89, No. 208).

VIII. 413, *l.* 13 from foot. *The work was composed in 1126 A. H. (1714 A. D.) by Mīr Muḥammad Yūsufī.*

Dr. Rieu points out that بيوسفي is a misreading of بوضعى (in such a manner), which occurs in the preface immediately after the author's name (Catalogue III. 1082).

VIII. 421, *l.* 8. *Be it not concealed that in the country of Hindustān, there is a set of babblers and fools who sit in the shops of hempsellers and say whatever comes into their minds.*

All this thunder is stolen. The whole paragraph has been lifted from the *'Imādu-s-Sa'ādat* (Lith. p. 28, *l.* 4).

The story on which this writer pours so much vehement scorn may be a rumour or canard, but it is related as a fact, by several authors of repute *e.g.* in the *Tārīkh-i-Hindī* of Rustam 'Alī, which was composed only three years after Nādir Shāh's invasion. See E. D. VIII. 64–65.

VIII. 425, *l.* 17 from foot. *The author of this work is Fakīr Muhammad ...... inhabitant of Rājāpūr, pargana of Sāntapūr in Bengal.*

Dr. Rieu reads the name of the *pargana* as Santūr, and the author himself states that it is in Chakla Bhūsna in Bengal (Catalogue III. 899). Bhūshna is now in the Farīdpūr district, Eastern Bengal.

INDEX

PLACES

PERSONS

GENERAL

CHRONOLOGY